DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 428 466 EA 029 753

TITLE U.S. Department of Education FY 2000 Annual Plan, Volume 2: Program Performance Plans.
INSTITUTION Department of Education, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 1999-02-25
NOTE 377p.; For Volume 1, see EA 029 752.
AVAILABLE FROM Tel: 800-USA-LEARN (Toll Free); e-mail: strategic_plan@ed.gov; Web site: http://www.ed.gov/pubs/
PUB TYPE Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC16 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Assessment; *Educational Objectives; Elementary Secondary Education; *Government Role; Government School Relationship; Performance; School Effectiveness
IDENTIFIERS Department of Education

ABSTRACT

This volume of the Department of Education's (ED) annual plan contains the program-performance plans to support efforts to reach the department's four goals. These four goals are as follows: (1) help all students reach challenging academic standards so that they are prepared for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment; (2) build a solid foundation for learning for all children; (3) ensure access to postsecondary education and lifelong learning; and (4) make ED a high-performance organization by focusing on results, service quality, and customer satisfaction. The goals represent key customer groups and education processes, starting with support for building the capacity of the elementary and secondary school system, moving to support for the conditions that must be achieved for specific K-12 target populations, and then to postsecondary-education access. It documents shared student- outcome indicators and focuses on education reform; education for disadvantaged children; school improvement and other elementary/secondary programs; bilingual education and minority foreign languages; special education; rehabilitation services and special institutions; vocational and adult education; student financial assistance; higher education; research and improvement; and civil rights. Each area features information on objectives; indicators; performance data; and source, periodicity, and next update. (RJM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

EA

ED 428 466

U.S. Department of Education

FY 2000 Annual Plan

Volume 2.
Program Performance Plans

February 25, 1999

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

EA 029 753

U.S. Department of Education

FY 2000 Annual Plan

Volume 2.

Program Performance Plans

February 25, 1999

Program Performance Plans

Programs and FY 2000 Budget Request

Shared Student Outcome Indicators from the National Assessment of Educational Progress Main Assessments 6

EDUCATION REFORM 7

- Goals 2000 State and Local Education Systemic Improvement—$491,000,000 (FY 2000) 8
- School-to-Work Opportunities--$55,000,000 (FY 2000) 11
- Technology Literacy Challenge Fund State and Local Programs for School Technology Resources, and Technology Innovation Challenge Grants and National Activities--$742,000,000 (FY 2000) 14
- Regional Technology in Education Consortia--$10,000,000 (FY 2000) 18
- Star Schools Program--$45,000,000 (FY 2000) 19
- Ready-To-Learn Television--$7,000,000 (FY 2000) 20
- Telecommunications Demonstration Project for Mathematics--$2,000,000 (FY 2000) 21
- 21st Century Community Learning Centers--$600,000,000 (FY 2000) 22

EDUCATION FOR DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN 25

- Title I Grants for Schools Serving At-Risk Children--$7,996,020,000 (FY 2000) 26
- Even Start Family Literacy Program--$145,000,000 (FY 2000) 30
- Migrant Education--$380,000,000 (FY 2000) 32
- Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected or Delinquent--$42,000,000 (FY 2000) 35
- Demonstrations of Comprehensive School Reform—$150,000,000 (FY 2000) 36
- High School Equivalency Program and College Assistance Migrant Program--$22,000,000 (FY 2000) 38

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT AND OTHER ELEMENTARY/SECONDARY PROGRAMS (IMPACT AID, CLASS SIZE, READING EXCELLENCE, AND INDIAN EDUCATION) 41

- Impact Aid--$736,000,000 (FY 2000) 42
- Eisenhower Professional Development Program--$335,000,000 (FY 2000) 44
- Innovative Education Program Strategies (Block Grant) (Title VI, ESEA)--$0 (FY 2000) 48
- Class-Size Reduction Program--$1,400,000,000 (FY 2000) 50
- Inexpensive Book Distribution--$18,000,000 (FY 2000) 55
- Arts Education--$10,500,000 (FY 2000) 56
- Magnet Schools Assistance Program--$114,000,000 (FY 2000) 57
- Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Program--$31,700,000 (FY 2000) 59
- Women's Educational Equity (WEEA)--$3,000,000 (FY 2000) 61
- Title IV of the Civil Rights Act: Equity Assistance Center Program--$7,334,000 (FY 2000) 62

Allen J. Ellender Fellowship Program--$0 (FY 2000) 63
Native Hawaiian Education Program--$20,000,000 (FY 2000) 64
Alaska Native Education Program--$10,000,000 (FY 2000) 65
Comprehensive Centers Program--$32,000,000 (FY 2000) 68
Advanced Placement Test Fees--$20,000,000 (FY 2000) 69
Reading Excellence Program--$286,000,000 (FY 2000) 70
Indian Education—$77,000,0000 (FY 2000) 73

BILINGUAL EDUCATION AND MINORITY FOREIGN LANGUAGES 75

Bilingual Education Instructional Services Program--$259,000,000 (FY 2000) 76
Foreign Language Assistance Program--$6,000,000 (FY 2000) 79
Emergency Immigrant Education Program--$150,000,000 (FY 2000) 80

SPECIAL EDUCATION (IDEA) 81

IDEA Part B – Grants to States--$4,716,435,000 (FY 2000) 82
IDEA Part C – Special Education - Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities--$390,000,000 (FY 2000) 86
IDEA Part D--National Activities--$343,461,000 (FY 2000) 89

REHABILITATION SERVICES AND SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS 93

State Vocational Rehabilitation Services (including Supported Employment)--$2,353,739,000 (FY 2000) 94
American Indian Vocational Rehabilitation Services--$23,390,000 (FY 2000) 97
Client Assistance Program (CAP)--$10,928,000 (FY 2000) 99
Training Program--$41,629,000 (FY 2000) 100
Special demonstration programs--$16,942,000 (FY2000) 101
Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers Program--$2,350,000 (FY 2000) 102
Recreation Program--$2,596,000 (FY 2000) 103
Protection & Advocacy of Individual Rights (PAIR)--$10,894,000 (FY 2000) 104
Projects with Industry (PWI), Section 611 — $22,071,000 (FY 2000) 105
Independent Living Programs--$84,574,000 (FY 2000) 106
Helen Keller National Center (HKNC) for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults--$8,550,000 (FY2000) 109
National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR)--$90,964,000 (FY 2000) 111
Assistive Technology Program--$45,000,000 (FY2000) 113
American Printing House for the Blind--$8,973,000 (FY 2000) 115
National Technical Institute for the Deaf--$47,925,000 (FY 2000) 117
Gallaudet University--$85,120,000 (FY 2000) 119

VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION 121

Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Act (State Grants and Tech-Prep Indicators)--$1,141,650,000 (FY 2000) . 122
National Programs (Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Act)--$17,500,000 (FY 2000) 125
Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Vocational Institutions—$4,100,000 (FY 2000) 127
Adult Education: State Grants and Knowledge Development—$569,000,000 (FY 2000) 128
National Institute for Literacy--$6,000,000 (FY 2000) 131

State Grants for Incarcerated Youth Offenders--$12,000,000 (FY 2000) 133

STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE **135**

Student Financial Assistance Programs--$9,183,000,000 (FY 2000) 136

HIGHER EDUCATION **143**

Aid for Institutional Development, Title III (HEA)--$259,825,000 (FY 2000) 144
International Education Programs--$69,022,000 (FY 2000) 148
Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education--$27,500,000 (FY 2000) 149
Urban Community Service Program--$0 (FY 2000) 151
Demonstration Projects to Ensure Students with Disabilities Receive a Quality Higher Education--$5,000,000 (FY 2000) 152
Annual Interest Subsidy Grants--$12,000,000 (FY 2000) 153
TRIO Programs--$630,000,000 (FY 2000) 154
GEAR UP--$240,000,000 (FY 2000) 156
Robert C. Byrd Honors Scholarships Program--$39,859,000 (FY 2000) 158
Child Care Access Means Parents in School Program--$5,000,000 (FY 2000) 160
Learning Anytime Anywhere Partnerships--$20,000,000 (FY 2000) 161
Preparing for College (prop.leg.)--$15,000,000 (FY 2000) 162
College Completion Challenge Grants --$35,000,000 (FY 2000) 163
Expansion of D.C. College Access Program--$17,000,000 (FY 2000) 164
Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants (HEA, II)--$115,000,000 (FY 2000) 165
Underground Railroad Program--$1,750,000 (FY 2000) 169
GPRA Data/Evaluation Program--$4,000,000 (FY 2000) 170
Howard University--$219,444,000 (FY 2000) 171

RESEARCH AND IMPROVEMENT **175**

National Education Research Institutes--$108,782,000 (FY 2000) 176
Regional Educational Laboratories--$65,000,000 (FY2000) 178
NCES Statistics and Assessment--$122,000,000 (FY 2000) 181
Eisenhower Federal Activities--$30,000,000 (FY 2000) 183
Fund for the Improvement of Education--$139,500,000 (FY 2000) 185
Javits Gifted And Talented Students Education--$6,500,000 (FY 2000) 186
Eisenhower Regional Mathematics and Science Education Consortia--$17,500,000 (FY 2000) 187
National Writing Project (NWP) --$10,000,000 (FY 2000) 188
Civic Education--$9,500,000 (FY 2000) 189
International Education Program (Student Achievement Institute)--$7,000,000 (FY 2000) 190

CIVIL RIGHTS **191**

Office for Civil Rights (OCR)--$73,262,000 (FY 2000) 192

Shared Student Outcome Indicators

(Several programs share common student performance indicators. These indicators are national in scope and are not program specific. Federal elementary and secondary programs are not solely responsible for, but should contribute to, their attainment. These programs are Goals 2000 ;Technology Literacy Challenge Fund and Technology Innovation Challenge Grants; Title I (shown separately for high-poverty schools); and IDEA Part B (to be shown separately for students with disabilities).

Percentage of Students Scoring at or above Achievement Levels

Subject	Grades	Year	At or above Basic	At or above Proficient
Reading	Grade 4	1992	62	29
		1994	60	30
		1998	62	31
		Goal 2002	66	33
	Grade 8	1992	69	29
		1994	70	30
		1998	74*+	33*+
		Goal 2002	79	36
Mathematics	Grade 4	1990	50	13
		1992	59*	18*
		1996	64*+	21*+
		Goal 2000	70	24
	Grade 8	1990	52	15
		1992	58*	21*
		1996	62*+	24*
		Goal 2000	70	27

* Indicates that the percentage shown is significantly different from that in the first year.

+ Indicates that the percentage shown is significantly different from that in the second year.

SOURCES: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 1992, 1994, and 1998 Reading Main Assessments and 1990, 1992, and 1996 Mathematics Main Assessments.

Education Reform
(Goals 2000, School to Work, and Education Technology)

Goals 2000 State and Local Education Systemic Improvement—$491,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To support comprehensive state and local education reform tied to high standards for all students

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Goals 2000 funds the development of standards (objective 1.1), teacher quality (objective 1.4), and family and community involvement (objective 1.5). It also authorizes the establishment of Ed-Flex, which provides states with waiver authority (objective 4.2).

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
1. **Help improve student achievement in core subjects through Goals 2000 operating in concert with other federal programs and state and local**	1.1 **Shared indicator on student performance on national assessments.** Between 1992 and 2002, the percentages of students who meet basic, proficient, and advanced levels in reading and math on the National Assessment of Educational Progress will increase. ❖ By 2002, 68% of 4th graders will score at or above the basic level in reading. ❖ By 2002, 32% of 4th graders will score at or above the proficient level in reading. ❖ By 2000, 70% of 8th graders will score at or above the basic level in math. ❖ By 2000, 28% of 8th graders will score at or above the proficient level in math.	*See "Shared Student Outcomes" at the front of the document (page 5).*	1.1 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) reading, 1998; NAEP math, 2000.
	1.2 **Meeting or exceeding state performance standards.** By 2002, 32 states with two years of assessment data and aligned standards and assessments will report an increase in the percentage of students meeting or exceeding proficient and advanced levels in reading and math on their State assessment systems.	*In 1996-97, 7 of the 10 states that had two years of assessment data reported that increased percentages of students attained proficient or advanced levels of performance in reading and math.*	1.2 Unpublished achievement data collected through the 1996-97 Title I Performance Report and follow-up in 1997-98..
2. **Stimulate and accelerate state and local reform efforts.**	2.1 **Standards for core subjects.** Increasing numbers of states will have content and performance standards in place in reading and math. By 2000, all states will have content and performance standards in place in reading and math.	*48 states, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia have completed the development of State content standards. One State is still in the process of developing state standards and in the other state local districts have the responsibility for developing standards acceptable to the State.*	2.1 Title I peer review records.
16	2.2 **Aligned assessments.** Increasing numbers of states will have assessments aligned to content and performance standards for two core subjects. By 2000, 40 states will have aligned assessments; by 2001, all will.	*As of the 1997-98 school year, 14 states had designed their own assessments to be aligned to state content standards.* 17	2.2 Standard-based Assessment and Accountability in American Education, draft, 1998.

Goals 2000 State and Local Education Systemic Improvement—$491,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To support comprehensive state and local education reform tied to high standards for all students

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Goals 2000 funds the development of standards (objective 1.1), teacher quality (objective 1.4), and family and community involvement (objective 1.5). It also authorizes the establishment of Ed-Flex, which provides states with waiver authority (objective 4.2).

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
	2.3 **Schools' alignment of key processes.** Principals in states or districts with standards will indicate that increasing percentages of schools have curriculum, instruction, professional development, and assessment aligned to the standards. By 2000, 75% of principals will report Implementing strategies to tie instructional materials, professional development, and assessments to standards.	*1997-98 Percentage of school principals in all states implementing strategies that tie to standards:* ➢ *50%, instructional materials* ➢ *40%, professional development* ➢ *40%, use of aligned assessments*	2.3 Follow-Up Survey of Schools, 1998.
3. **Promote parental and community involvement in student learning through the Parent Information and Resource Assistance Centers (PIRCs).**	3.1 **PAT/ HIPPY participation.** The number of families who participate in Parents as Teachers (PAT) or Home Instruction for Preschool Youngsters (HIPPY) will increase annually. By 2000, approximately 14,000 families will participate in PAT or HIPPY.	*In 1995, approximately 5,000 families participated in PAT or HIPPY compared to approximately 6,000 in 1996 and approximately 10,000 in 1997.*	3.1 Annual reports for Parental Information and Resource Assistance Centers (PIRCs), 1999.
4. **Promote excellent teaching that will enable all students to reach challenging state and/or local standards.**	4.1 **Teachers' knowledge of standards.** Increasing percentages of teachers in states with standards understand state or local content and performance standards as they apply to the grades and subjects they teach. By 2000, 75% of teachers in states with standards will report that they understood state or local standards.	*In 1995-96, 42% of teachers in all states reported that they understood the concept of higher standards very well.* *In 1998, 38% of full-time public school teachers indicated that they felt very well prepared to implement state or district curriculum and performance standards.*	4.1 National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1999. Teacher Quality: A Report on the Preparation & Qualifications of Public School Teachers, 1999;
	4.2 **Professional development.** The percentage of teachers who indicate that they are engaged in professional development that is enabling them to teach to challenging standards will increase annually. By 2000, 50% of teachers will report such participation.	*During the 1994-95 school year, 28% of teachers in all states indicated that they had participated in professional development activities useful for helping students achieve to high standards to a great extent.* *In 1998, 81% of public school teachers reported that they had participated in professional development that focused on State or district standards in the last 12 months. However, only 38% reporting feeling well prepared to implement the standards.*	4.2 National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1999; Schools and Staffing Survey, 1999; Teacher Quality: A Report on the Preparation & Qualifications of Public School Teachers, 1999;

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Goals 2000 State and Local Education Systemic Improvement—$491,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: **To support comprehensive state and local education reform tied to high standards for all students**

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Goals 2000 funds the development of standards (objective 1.1), teacher quality (objective 1.4), and family and community involvement (objective 1.5). It also authorizes the establishment of Ed-Flex, which provides states with waiver authority (objective 4.2).

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
5. **Effective federal program management will support State and local reform.**	5.1 **Satisfaction with Goals 2000 administration.** Increasing percentages of Goals 2000 customers (e.g., SEA and LEA staff) report that the technical assistance provided by federal Goals 2000 staff is of high quality, useful, and meets their needs.	*In 1998, 39 Goals 2000 State coordinators reported that written information they received from the Department was helpful or very helpful; 40 Goals 2000 State coordinators reported that other contacts with the Department (conferences, workshops, on-line services & telephone) were helpful or very helpful.*	5.1 Follow-Up State Implementation Study, 1999.

Key Strategies

- Provide assistance at the state and school levels for improved school performance and increased family and community engagement in learning, through Department service teams, technical assistance centers, and state school support teams.
- Support interstate working groups to discuss how to improve and measure student achievement and to identify the types of Goal 2000 activities that support gains in student achievement.
- Encourage states and districts to share their model standards as they relate to the reading, math, and college preparation initiatives.
- Expand public understanding of the need for challenging academic standards by disseminating information on standards-based reform through states, national associations, and other stakeholders.
- Help states and districts develop and implement aligned assessments designed to improve student learning by providing financial support under Goals 2000 and Title I and by encouraging the sharing of effective methodologies.
- Regularly assess the adequacy and effectiveness of support that each funded Parental Assistance Center project devotes to PAT and HIPPY activities and ensure that the centers devote a substantial part of their budget to these activities to support school readiness for all children.
- Support efforts to prepare future teachers to meet high certification and licensing standards by promoting partnerships between school districts and institutions of higher education.

School-to-Work Opportunities--$55,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To Build School-to-Work (STW) Systems That Increase Student Academic Achievement, Improve Technical Skills, and Broaden Career Opportunities for All

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: All objectives in this table support the Department of Education Strategic Plan Objective 1.2: Every state has a school-to-work system that increases student achievement, improves technical skills, and broadens career opportunities for all.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
Student Participation			
1. All youth—including those who are disadvantaged, have limited English proficiency, are academically gifted, are out of school or disabled—have the opportunity to engage actively in School-to-Work systems.	1.1 **Student Participation in STW Systems.** By Fall 2000, two million youth will be participating in STW systems. *Participation is defined as receiving an integrated academic and occupational curriculum and completing a related work-based learning experience.*	*The number of students that met this criterion grew from 280,000 in 1995-96 to 471,698 in 1996-97.*	1.1 Progress Measures Survey, annual, July 1999.
Student Achievement in STW Systems			
2. All youth earn a high school diploma or equivalency, meet challenging academic standards, have the opportunity to receive a skill certificate, and are prepared for postsecondary education and careers.	2.1 **Academic Achievement.** The percentage of high school graduates (including vocational concentrators) in STW systems who complete at least three years each of math and science will increase to 80%.	*In 1995-96, 63% of students took three years of math, 73% took three years of science, and 69% took three years of both.*	2.1 National School-to-Work Evaluation, Student Transcripts of High School Seniors in Eight States, biennial, Fall 1999.
	2.2 **Transition from High School.** The number of high school graduates who successfully transition into employment, further education, or the military will increase by 5%.	*In 1995-96, 60% of graduates in STW systems entered college, 7% entered the military or a non-college postsecondary program, and 20% were employed.*	2.2 National School-to-Work Evaluation, Follow-Up Survey of High School Seniors in Eight States, biennial, Summer 2000.
	2.3 **Skill Certificates.** By Fall 2000, 10% of students in local STW systems will earn skill certificates.	*The number of senior who received skill certificates grew from 2.4% in 1995-96 to 3.6% in 1996-97.*	2.3 National School-to-Work Evaluation, Local Partnership Survey, annual, Summer 1999.
	2.4 **Out-of-School Youth**. By fall 2000, in local STW systems, the percentage of out-of-school youth acquiring high school equivalency diplomas will be higher than the percentage who achieved diplomas in Spring 1997.		2.4 National School-to-Work Evaluation, Local Partnership Survey, annual, Summer 1999; National Longitudinal Survey for Youth, periodic, *2000.*

School-to-Work Opportunities--$55,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To Build School-to-Work (STW) Systems That Increase Student Academic Achievement, Improve Technical Skills, and Broaden Career Opportunities for All

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: All objectives in this table support the Department of Education Strategic Plan Objective 1.2: Every state has a school-to-work system that increases student achievement, improves technical skills, and broadens career opportunities for all.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
System Building			
3. Build comprehensive school-to-work systems in every State.	3.1 **Sustainable Systems.** States ensure the sustainability of their STW systems beyond the period of federal funding.		3.1 National School-to-Work Office Site Visit Reviews, periodic, initial list of elements to support sustainability is expected by fall 1998.
	3.2 **High Schools.** By Fall 2000, 40% of high schools will have implemented key STW components.	*There was no change in the percent (25%) of high schools that implemented career major programs and work-based learning programs between 1995-96 and 1996-97.*	3.2 National School-to-Work Evaluation, Local Partnership Survey, annual, 1999.
	3.3 **Community and Technical Colleges**. By fall 2000, 40% of community and technical colleges will have agreements with high schools to grant academic credit for work-based learning.	*The percent of colleges that had such agreements dropped slightly from 20.7% in 1995-96 to 18.4% in 1996-97.*	3.3 National School-to-Work Evaluation, Local Partnership Survey, annual, 1999.
	3.4 **Employers Providing Work-Based Learning Opportunities.** By Fall 2000, 350,000 employers will be providing work-based learning experiences for students.	*The number of employers providing students with work-based learning experiences grew from 59,000 in 1995-96 to 136,000 in 1996-97.*	3.4 Progress Measures Survey, annual, 1999.

School-to-Work Opportunities--$55,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To Build School-to-Work (STW) Systems That Increase Student Academic Achievement, Improve Technical Skills, and Broaden Career Opportunities for All

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: All objectives in this table support the Department of Education Strategic Plan Objective 1.2: Every state has a school-to-work system that increases student achievement, improves technical skills, and broadens career opportunities for all.

Key Strategies

- Provide technical assistance to grantees to build and sustain STW systems. This may include conducting or sponsoring training institutes, identifying exemplary models and promising practices or identifying additional sources of funding.
- Support high school reform. Through such efforts as the New American High Schools and New Urban High School initiatives, identify, document, disseminate and implement the work of high schools that have adopted strategies to improve student achievement and to help students make a smooth transition to college and careers.
- Support high academic achievement for students and preparation for postsecondary education. Promote strategies for integrating curriculum and linking work-based learning with school-based learning.
- Sponsor the Building Linkages Project to develop, around broad industry clusters, new ways to integrate academic requirements and industry-recognized skill standards into multi-state career pathways systems, in collaboration with the National Skill Standards Board.
- Incorporate STW tenets into existing Job Corps programs and curricula.
- Involve schools, colleges, and employers in building school-to-work systems and stronger vocational education programs.
- Engage high schools, postsecondary institutions, and adult high schools by sponsoring a national information center and by creating networks that include educators, employers, and other key stakeholder groups.
- Sponsor efforts to align postsecondary admissions policies with new methods of assessing high school student performance.
- Prepare teachers to fully participate in School-to-Work by helping colleges of education incorporate School-to-Work elements in their curricula.
- Support teacher training efforts aimed at improving the skills of teachers in using contextual learning approaches to instruction of basic and technical skills.
- Foster education career academies to recruit and train teachers.
- Build strong employer participation in school-to-work by targeting outreach activities at employers and their organizations.
- Strengthen and promote the role of intermediaries in linking school-based learning with work-based learning.

Technology Literacy Challenge Fund State and Local Programs for School Technology Resources, and Technology Innovation Challenge Grants and National Activities--$742,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: **To use educational technology as part of broader education reform that will provide new learning opportunities and raise educational achievement for all students.**

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: The Technology Literacy Challenge Fund and the Technology Innovation Challenge Grants support objective 1.7 (schools use advanced technology to improve education) by providing fund to increase school and student access to educational technology and to promote the development of models of effective practice in integrating educational technology into teaching and learning.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
1.1 **Help improve student achievement in core subjects through federal educational technology programs operating along with other federal programs and state and local reform efforts.**	1.1 **Shared indicator of national student performance.** Between 1992 and 2002 the percentages of students who meet basic, proficient and advanced levels in reading and math on the National Assessment of Educational Progress will increase. ➢ By 2002, 66% of 4th graders will score at or above the basic level in reading. ➢ By 2002, 33% of 4th graders will score at or above the proficient level in reading. ➢ By 2000, 70% of 8th graders will score at or above the basic level in math. ➢ By 2000, 27% of 8th graders will score at or above the proficient level in math.	*See "Shared Student Outcomes" at the front of the document (page 5).*	1.1 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) reading, every 4 years, 1999; NAEP math, every 4 years, 1999.
2. **Help improve students' technology literacy through federal educational technology programs along with other federal programs and state and local reform efforts.**	2.1 **Student proficiency in technology**. Between 1998 and 2001, the percentage of students who demonstrate proficiency in using multimedia computers and the Internet[i] will increase.	*In 1997-98, 38 states had standards or graduation requirements pertaining to technology.*	2.1 Education Week, Technology Counts, 1998; Developmental work on assessment of student proficiency in use of technology, 1999.
Teachers, students, and classroom			
3. **Provide practicing and prospective teachers with the professional development and support they need to help students learn through modern multi-media computers[ii] and the Internet**	3.1 **Certification tied to technology training.** Training in the use of modern multimedia computers and the Internet for effective instruction will be increasingly required for certification and accreditation of practicing and prospective teachers, schools, and districts.	*In 1997-98, 38 States had technology requirements either for teaching candidates or for teacher preparation programs. Only 3 States required teachers to participate in training in technology as a condition for renewing their license.*	3.1 Education Week, Technology Counts, 1998.

Technology Literacy Challenge Fund State and Local Programs for School Technology Resources, and Technology Innovation Challenge Grants and National Activities--$742,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To use educational technology as part of broader education reform that will provide new learning opportunities and raise educational achievement for all students.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: The Technology Literacy Challenge Fund and the Technology Innovation Challenge Grants support objective 1.7 (schools use advanced technology to improve education) by providing fund to increase school and student access to educational technology and to promote the development of models of effective practice in integrating educational technology into teaching and learning.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
	3.2 **Staff training and support.** Increasing proportions of teachers will have the professional development and the administrative, technical, and local financial support they need to help students learn through modern multimedia computers and the Internet.	*According to a 1998 survey, 20% of teachers reported feeling very well prepared to integrate educational technology in to classroom instruction.*	3.2 Teacher Quality: Report on the Preparation of Public School Teachers, 1999.
4. **Encourage expansion of student access to modern multimedia computers.**	4.1 **Student access.** The ratio of students to modern multimedia computers in public schools will improve to 5 students per modern multimedia computer by the year 2000.	*In 1996-97, the number of students per instructional computer was 7.3 and the ratio of students to multimedia computers was 21.2. In 1997-98, the numbers were 6.3and 12.5 respectively.*	4.1 Market Data Retrieval, 1998; Advanced Telecommunications in U.S. Public Elementary and Secondary Schools Survey, 1998; and the Study of Educational Resources and Funding, 1998.
	4.2 **Access in high-poverty schools.** The access to education technology in high-poverty schools will be comparable to that in other schools.	*In 1997-98, high-poverty schools had a ratio of about 17 students per computer, compared with 12 students per computer in low-poverty schools.* *In 1997-98, federal funds paid for 50% of computers purchased for high-poverty schools and 14% of computers purchased for low-poverty schools.*	4.2 Study of Educational Resources and Federal Funding, 1999
	4.3 **Effective technologies.** Students with disabilities will have access to effective technologies for learning.		4.3 Same as 4.2
5. **Support linking all schools and classrooms to the Internet.**	5.1 **School access.** The percentage of public schools with access to the Internet will increase to 95% by 2000.	*In 1996, 65% of public schools were connected to the Internet.*	5.1 Advanced Telecommunications in U.S. Public Elementary and Secondary Schools survey, 1997; National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1998; and the Study of Educational Resources and Funding , 1999.
	5.2 **Classroom access.** The percentage of public school instructional rooms connected to the Internet will increase from 14% in 1996 to higher percentages thereafter.	*In 1997, 27% of public school instructional rooms had internet access.*	5.2 Same as 5.1.

Technology Literacy Challenge Fund State and Local Programs for School Technology Resources, and Technology Innovation Challenge Grants and National Activities--$742,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To use educational technology as part of broader education reform that will provide new learning opportunities and raise educational achievement for all students.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: The Technology Literacy Challenge Fund and the Technology Innovation Challenge Grants support objective 1.7 (schools use advanced technology to improve education) by providing fund to increase school and student access to educational technology and to promote the development of models of effective practice in integrating educational technology into teaching and learning.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
6. Promote the availability and use of technology-based curricula and the resources of the Internet part of a challenging and enriching curriculum in every school.	6.1 **Classroom use.** An increasing number of teachers will integrate high-quality technology-based curriculum into their instruction.	*In fall 1996, 20% of public school teachers used advanced telecommunications for teaching. In 1994, about 40% of 4th grade students and 17% of 8th grade students had teachers reporting use of computers to teach reading. In 1996 about 75% of 4th grade students and 46% of 8th grade students had teachers reporting use of computers for math instruction.*	6.1 NAEP, 1996; National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1998; Challenge Fund Supplementary Study, 1998; High Intensity Technology Sites Study 1999; Technology Innovation Challenge Grant performance reports, 1998.
7. Promote effective federal program management and guidance to support state and local implementation of statewide technology plans and the use of innovative strategies.	7.1 **Technical assistance.** The technical assistance and other support that the U.S. Department of Education provides, either directly or through its programs, will be of high quality and useful, and will be judged by customers as adequate to meet their needs.		7.1 Data from TLCF and TICG application and outreach work, 1999; R*TEC customer survey; TLCF Supplemental Study, 2000.
	7.2 **Private sector collaboration.** Private sector participation in planning, support, and implementation of educational technology at the state and local levels will increase.	*In 1996, 10% of schools had funds for educational technology from business or industry (and 13% for hardware, 9% for software, 5% for training 7% for technical assistance, and 4% for advanced telecommunications).*	7.2 Advanced Telecommunications in U.S. Public Elementary and Secondary Schools Survey, 1996; Study of Educational Resources and Funding , 1999.

Technology Literacy Challenge Fund State and Local Programs for School Technology Resources, and Technology Innovation Challenge Grants and National Activities--$742,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: **To use educational technology as part of broader education reform that will provide new learning opportunities and raise educational achievement for all students.**

Relationship of Program Goal to Strategic Plan: The Technology Literacy Challenge Fund and the Technology Innovation Challenge Grants support objective 1.7 (schools use advanced technology to improve education) by providing fund to increase school and student access to educational technology and to promote the development of models of effective practice in integrating educational technology into teaching and learning.

Key Strategies

- Provide financial and technical assistance to expand classroom access, particularly in high-poverty schools, to modern multi-media computers, the Internet, networked learning environments, engaging software and on-line resources integrated with school curricula.
- Coordinate with related technology initiatives at the federal, state and local levels and with professional development programs to promote effective use of educational technology.
- Identify effective approaches for using educational technology to improve student achievement in core subjects and disseminate information on these approaches. Also identify effective approaches for improving students' technology literacy and disseminate information on these approaches.
- Support development of assessments that measure students' technology proficiency.
- Connect with institutions of higher education (including colleges of education) for high-quality pre-service and in-service training for teachers in educational technology.
- Develop models that provide teachers with sustained training and support in the use of technology for improved instruction.
- Encourage development and demonstration of effective strategies for improving the use of educational technology, particularly in high-poverty schools, and for training teachers to effectively use technology in instruction.
- Identify gaps in data sources on use and effectiveness of educational technology, and work to fill those information gaps.
- Work with the Federal Communications Commission to expand schools' access to advanced telecommunications.
- Encourage states to use their federal funds to leverage and coordinate with other programs to support effective use of educational technology.
- Report to report on states' progress relative to their own goals and to target program improvement efforts within states and to identify success in integrating technology into school curricula.
- Expand access to technology for children, families, and adults in low-income communities through community-based technology centers.

---

[i] **Internet** -- a network of networks all running TCP/IP protocols, sharing the same underlying network address space as well as the same domain name space, and connected to a network of information.

[ii] **Modern multimedia computers** -- computers with CD-ROM, graphics, and sound capabilities.

[iii] **Advanced telecommunications** -- refers to modes of communication used to transmit information from one place to another, including broadcast and interactive television and networked computers.

Regional Technology in Education Consortia--$10,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To improve teaching and learning by providing technical assistance and professional development for the effective use of educational technology.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: R*TEC provides technical assistance to support strategic plan objective 1.1 – States develop and implement standards; 1.4 – Talented and dedicated teachers; 1.5 – Families and communities; 1.7 – Technology; 2.4 – Special populations help; 3.4 – Lifelong learning; 4.3 – Research, evaluation and improvement.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
1. **Promote effective use of technology for teaching and learning through professional development and technical assistance, and the leveraging and coordination of other resources.**	1.1 **Recipients of R*TEC products, services and information – particularly those representing under-served schools.** An increasing proportion of recipients (individuals or agencies) of the R*TEC services and products –including those developed and produced through the Consortia, collaboration among RTECs, and strategic alliances– will indicate that these products and services are of high quality and meet their needs. By FY 2000, 80 percent of R*TEC clients will agree or strongly agree that R*TEC services are of high quality and meet their needs. Target: Consortia will maintain high client satisfaction levels where at least 85% of R*TEC clients agree or strongly agree that R*TEC products and services are of high quality.	*In FY 1998, 92% of R*TEC clients agreed or strongly agreed that R*TEC products, overall, were of high quality; 84% agreed or strongly agreed that R*TEC services, overall, were of high quality.*	1.1 Annual Program Performance Report, 2000.

Key Strategies

- ❖ Disseminate high-quality information and resources on the effective planning and use of technology in education.
- ❖ Assess customer satisfaction about major areas of work, document and evaluate performance
- ❖ Collaborate with SEAs, LEAs and other educational entities to inform and support better planning, increased access to technologies, more advanced uses of technology, and enhanced instructional practice.
- ❖ Support increasing communication and collaboration among consortia and coordination with other programs, particularly those with an educational technology focus.
- ❖ Assess the value and impact of alliances (through surveys, focus groups, or other means of inquiry) and use the findings to improve alliances over time.

Star Schools Program–$45,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To improve student learning and teaching through the use of distance learning technologies.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: The Star Schools Program supports objective 1.7 (schools use advanced technology to improve education) by providing grants to support distance education.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
1. **Improve teaching and learnin through increased access to distance education.**	1.1 **Non-traditional settings.** The number of learners in non-traditional settings (community centers, correctional facilities, etc.) who participate in distance education will increase annually.	*In 1997 Star Schools projects provided services to 194,000 nontraditional students.* *In 1998, Star Schools projects provided services to 278,744 nontraditional students.*	1.1 Annual performance reports, 1998; national program evaluation results, 1999.
2. **Promote the delivery of challenging content in core subjects.**	2.1 **Challenging content.** Use of challenging technology-based content aligned with standards at all academic levels (including high school credit, advanced placement, adult education, and GED courses) through distance education will increase annually.	*In 1994, more than 30 full credit courses were offered through Star Schools. In 1997 and in 1998, more than 150 full credit courses were offered through Star Schools each year.*	2.1 Evaluation of Star Schools, 1994; Annual performance reports, 1998; national program evaluation 1999.

Key Strategies

- ❖ Use NCES data to identify communities representing high populations of under-served students. Develop and update an on-line map of communities participating in the program.
- ❖ Work with project directors and program evaluators to ensure that relevant data on schools, non-traditional settings and access to technology are collected on an annual basis.
- ❖ Provide access to standards materials on-line and via print (by subject area). Convene workshops and provide technical assistance about aligning standards to programming with resources from other federally sponsored programs.
- ❖ Disseminate information about Star Schools course offerings through the Department's web site, workshops, and national meetings.
- ❖ In collaboration with R*TECs and other ED programs, provide financial and technical assistance and disseminate information about successful models to support staff professional development.
- ❖ In collaboration with other programs, increase research-based practice about the use and impact of distance learning through research, evaluation, and dissemination activities.

Ready-To-Learn Television--$7,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To develop, produce, and distribute video programming and educational materials for preschool and elementary school children and their parents in order to facilitate the achievement of the National Education Goal for all children in America to start school ready to learn.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Ready to learn television's activities support objective 2.1 (children enter school ready to learn) and 2.2 (reading) through the development and distribution of educational video for preschool and elementary school children and their parents. Another feature of the program is training parents and caregivers through community partnerships - objective 1.5 (families and communities).

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
1. **Develop, produce, and distribute high quality televised educational programming and written educational materials, for preschool and elementary school children and their caregivers.**	1.1 **Distribution of educational television programs.** Ready to Learn (RTL) programs will reach an increasing number of viewers. Each RTL educational program will reach between 4.5 and 6 million adults and young viewers weekly (based on A.C. Nielson data from similar children's/parenting programming). The programs will air in the Fall of 1999 and the projected numbers should be reached in the first season.	*The number of RTL participating stations has grown from 48 in 1995 to 122 in 1998. The current number represents a potential reach of 90% of the nation.*	1.1 Annual Performance Reports from the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, 1999; reports from producers, WGBH-Boston and The Children's Television Workshop, every 4-6 months, 1999.
2. **Provide training to education personnel in the public television community so that they can train parents and caregivers to help children become ready to learn.**	2.1 **Training for parents and caregivers.** The number of parents and caregivers trained will increase to 318,000 in FY 2000.	*In FY 1998, 119,000 parents and caregivers were trained.*	2.1 CPB Annual Performance Reports, 1999.

Key Strategies

- Monitor progress of current projects and monitor program quality. For example, review performance reports from the CPB, the Children's Television Workshop, and WGBH – Boston.
- Participate in developing and supporting collaborations with other federal agencies, foundations, and related early childhood groups.
- Support the development and use of workshops to distribute educational material and information to caregivers and children.
- Provide educational materials through the RTL web site.
- Evaluate the training quality and RTL programming and outreach activities.
- Support and develop workshops for training of RTL coordinators and caregivers.

40

41

Telecommunications Demonstration Project for Mathematics--$2,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To improve the learning and teaching of mathematics through the use of technology.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: The Telecommunications Demonstration Project for Mathematics provides support for objectives 1.7 and 2.3. The program provides assistance to teachers through the development of broadcast programming, videos, support materials and on-line services to improve student skills in and understanding of mathematics.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
1. **Promote excellent teaching in mathematics through sustained professional development and teacher networks.**	1.1 **Increasing participation in sustained professional development.** The number of teachers sharing resources and engaged in other professional development activities through on-line learning communities will increase annually. An increasing proportion of participating teachers will report improvements in practice and methods that align with standards resulting from sharing resources through on-line learning communities.	*Over 5,800 teachers shared resources and engaged in other professional development activities through Telecommunications Demonstration Project on-line learning communities in 1998.*	1.1 Annual review of grant performance reports,1998, 1999; teacher surveys collected by the project, 1998, 1999.

Key Strategies

- Provide financial assistance to support development of videos, support materials, and online services. Based on needs identified by the Third International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) data and other national math assessments, the Office of Educational Research and Improvement will work with the Public Broadcasting Service to develop a specific focus and content for math programming.

21st Century Community Learning Centers–$600,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: **To enable rural and inner-city public elementary and secondary schools, or consortia of such schools, to plan, implement, or expand projects that benefit the educational, health, social service, cultural and recreational needs of their communities.**

Relationship of Objectives to Strategic Plan: Supports objective 1.5 (families and communities are fully involved with schools and school improvement efforts) by turning schools into Community Learning Centers. Also supports objective 1.3 by supporting extended learning programs based in schools before or after school hours; and supports objectives 2.2, 2.3, and 2.4 by providing academic support and enrichment in core subject areas including reading and mathematics to help students meet or exceed state and local standards.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
Benefits of services			
1. **Participants in 21st Century Community Learning Center programs will demonstrate educational and social benefits and exhibit positive behavioral changes.**	1.1 **Achievement**. Beginning in 2000, Centers will report continuous improvement in achievement among students participating in reading and mathematics activities.		1.1 New grantee performance reports focused on after school, annual, 2000; planned external evaluation, 2000.
	1.2 **Outcomes and behavior**. Beginning in 2000, Centers will report that more than 75% of students participating in the program for at least 2 years show improvements on measures such as grades, attendance, taking of advanced or challenging courses such as algebra, honors courses, and AP courses, and decreased disciplinary actions.		1.2 Grantee reports, annual, 1999; planned external evaluation, 2000.
	1.3 **Student reports**. More than 75% of students participating in Center programs report them to be beneficial, enjoyable, and of high quality.		1.3 Grantee reports, annual, 1999; planned external evaluation, 2000.
	1.4 **Teacher reports.** Teachers will report improvement in participant classroom performance, behavior, homework completion, and class participation.		1.4 Grantee reports, annual, 2000; planned external evaluation, 2000.
Services that meet broad community needs			
2. **21st Century Community Learning Centers will offer a range of high-quality educational, developmental, and recreational services.**	2.1 **Core educational services**. More than 85% of Centers will offer high quality services in core academic areas, e.g. reading and literacy, mathematics, and science.	*A review of grantee applications indicates that 87% of funded projects proposed a reading component; 86% proposed a mathematics component; and 72% proposed a science component.*	2.1 Grantee reports, annual, 1999

21st Century Community Learning Centers--$600,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: **To enable rural and inner-city public elementary and secondary schools, or consortia of such schools, to plan, implement, or expand projects that benefit the educational, health, social service, cultural and recreational needs of their communities.**

Relationship of Objectives to Strategic Plan: Supports objective 1.5 (families and communities are fully involved with schools and school improvement efforts) by turning schools into Community Learning Centers. Also supports objective 1.3 by supporting extended learning programs based in schools before or after school hours; and supports objectives 2.2, 2.3, and 2.4 by providing academic support and enrichment in core subject areas including reading and mathematics to help students meet or exceed state and local standards.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
	2.2 **Enrichment and support activities**. More than 85% of Centers will offer enrichment and support activities such as nutrition and health, art, music, technology, and recreation.	*A review of grantee applications indicates that 80% of funded projects proposed a nutrition and health component; 74% proposed an art component; 62% proposed a music component; 93% proposed a technology component and 90% proposed recreational activities.*	2.2 Grantee reports, annual, 1999.
	2.3 **Extended hours**. More than 75% of Centers will offer services at least 3 hours a day, 5 days a week.		2.3 Grantee reports, annual, 1999.
	2.4 **Retention in program**. More than 50% of participants will continue in the program throughout the year.		2.4 Grantee reports, annual, 1999, and planned external evaluation, 2000.
Services to high-need communities			
3. **21st Century Community Learning Centers will serve children and community members with the greatest needs for expanded learning opportunities.**	3.1 **High-need elementary schools**. More than 80% of elementary schools establishing Centers will have student populations where 35% or more of the children are eligible for free or reduced-price lunch.		3.1 Review of applications for newly funded projects, annual, 1999.
	3.2 **High-need middle and high schools**. More than 80% of middle or high schools establishing Centers will have daily attendance below the state average and dropout rates above the state average or student performance below the state average on state assessment.		3.2 Review of applications for newly funded projects, annual, 1999.

Key Strategies

- Establish absolute priority for programs that offer extended learning opportunities.
- Establish competitive preference for programs that help students meet or exceed state and local standards in core subjects such as reading, mathematics, or science.
- Develop training and technical assistance opportunities for grantees to ensure the quality of implemented programs.
- In partnership with national foundations, provide ongoing training and technical assistance to Center leadership and staff.
- Create grantee advisory groups and listservs to facilitate exchange of best practices and materials.
- Establish priorities for programs that serve economically distressed rural and urban communities.

Education for Disadvantaged Children

Title I Grants for Schools Serving At-Risk Children--$7,996,020,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: **At-risk students improve their achievement to meet challenging standards.**

Relationship of Program to the Strategic Plan: Title I supports objectives 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, and 2.4 of the Department's strategic plan by funding services to enable at-risk students in low-income communities to meet challenging academic standards. It also helps build the capacity of schools in low-income communities to improve their performance through supporting standards and assessment development (objective 1.1), staff professional development (objective 1.4), family involvement (objective 1.5), and technology (objective 1.7).

Objective	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
1. Performance of the lowest achieving students and students in the highest-poverty public schools will increase substantially in reading and math.	1.1 **Shared indicator on student performance on national assessments.** Between 1994 and 2002, performance of the lowest achieving students and students in the highest-poverty public schools will increase substantially on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) in reading and math.		
	Reading Targets: ❖ In 2002, reading scale scores for 4th grade students in the bottom 25th percentile will increase by one grade level (or 10 points). ❖ In 2002, reading scale scores for 8th grade students in the bottom 25th percentile will increase by one grade level (or 10 points). ❖ In 2002, 50% of 4th grade students in public schools with more than 75% low-income children will score at or above the *Basic* level.	***Reading*** ❖ *In 1998, the average scale score for 4th grade public school students in the bottom 25th percentile was 192, an increase from 187 in 1994.* ❖ *In 1998, the average scale score for 8th grade public school students in the bottom 25th percentile was 240, an increase from 234 in 1994.* ❖ *In 1998, 32% of 4th grade students in schools with more than 75% low-income children scored at or above the Basic level.*	1.1 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) reading, 1998 and 2002; NAEP math, 1996 and 2000.
	Mathematics Targets: ❖ In 2000, math scale scores for 4th grade students in the bottom 25th percentile will increase by one grade level (or 10 points). ❖ In 2000, math scale scores for 8th grade students in the bottom 25th percentile will increase by one grade level (or 10 points). ❖ In 2000, 50% of 4th grade students in schools with more than 75% low-income children will score at or above the *Basic* level.	***Mathematics*** ❖ *In 1996, the average scale score for 4th grade public school students in the bottom 25th percentile was 201, in increase from 197 in 1992.* ❖ *In 1996, the average scale score for 8th grade public school students in the bottom 25th percentile was 249, an increase from 247 in 1992.* ❖ *In 1996, 42% of 4th grade students in schools with more than 75% low-income children scored at or above the Basic level.*	

Title I Grants for Schools Serving At-Risk Children--$7,996,020,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: At-risk students improve their achievement to meet challenging standards.

Relationship of Program to the Strategic Plan: Title I supports objectives 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, and 2.4 of the Department's strategic plan by funding services to enable at-risk students in low-income communities to meet challenging academic standards. It also helps build the capacity of schools in low-income communities to improve their performance through supporting standards and assessment development (objective 1.1), staff professional development (objective 1.4), family involvement (objective 1.5), and technology (objective 1.7).

Objective	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
	1.2 **Meeting or exceeding state performance standards.** By 2002, 32 states with 2 years of assessment data and aligned standards and assessments will report an increase in the percentage of students in schools with at least 50% poverty who meet proficient and advanced performance levels in reading and math on their state assessment systems.	*In 1997-98, 7 of the 10 states that had 2 years of assessment data (disaggregated for public schools with at least 50 percent poverty) reported that increased percentages of students attained proficient and advanced levels of performance.*	1.2 State Education Indicators with a focus on Title I, 1998.
2. **Increase the number of Title I schools using standards-based reform and effective strategies to enable all students to reach state and local performance standards.**	2.1 **Use of challenging standards**. By the year 2000, all schools receiving Title I funds will report the use of content standards *to guide curriculum and instruction.*	*In 1997-98, 72% of principals from Title I schools reported the use of content standards in reading and 71% reported the use of content standards in math.*	2.1 National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1999 Follow-Up Survey of Schools, 1998.
	2.2 **Improving schools:** By the year 2000, an increased percentage of Title I participating schools will report that they have met or exceeded state or district standards for progress for two consecutive years.	*In 1998, 57% of the schools reported that they had met the state or district standards for progress for 2 consecutive years.*	2.2 Follow-Up Survey of Schools, 1998 ; Annual Title I State Performance Reports, 1998.
	2.3 **Extended learning time**. By the year 2000, 60% of Title I schools will operate before- and after-school, summer, and other programs to extend and reinforce student learning.	*In 1998, 41% of Title I schools used Title I funds to provide extended learning time; and 39% used Title I funds to support summer school activities.*	2.3 Follow-up Public School Survey on Education Reform, 1998; National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1999.
	2.4 **Research-based curriculum and instruction**. The percentage of Title I schools using comprehensive, research-based approaches to improve curriculum and instruction will increase annually.		2.4 Baseline data will be reported from the National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1999
	2.5 **School-parent compacts**. By the year 2000, 90% of Title I participating schools will report that their school staffs find school-parent compacts and other tools helpful to enhance communication between parents and schools and to improve student learning.	*In 1998, principals in Title I schools reported that school-parent compacts have been helpful in supporting homework completion:* ❖ *81% in 75-100 % poverty* ❖ *59% in 0-34.9% poverty* *and assisting students in coming to school prepared:* ❖ *56% in 75-100% poverty* ❖ *42% in 0-34.9% poverty*	2.5 Follow-up Public School Survey on Education Reform,1998; National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1999.

Title I Grants for Schools Serving At-Risk Children--$7,996,020,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: At-risk students improve their achievement to meet challenging standards.

Relationship of Program to the Strategic Plan: Title I supports objectives 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, and 2.4 of the Department's strategic plan by funding services to enable at-risk students in low-income communities to meet challenging academic standards. It also helps build the capacity of schools in low-income communities to improve their performance through supporting standards and assessment development (objective 1.1), staff professional development (objective 1.4), family involvement (objective 1.5), and technology (objective 1.7).

Objective	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
	2.6 **Qualified teacher aides**. By 2000, 35% of Title I school principals will report increased district support for the educational improvement of paraprofessionals and teacher aides.	*In 1998, 24% of principals in Title I schools employing aides reported that their districts offered a career ladder for paraprofessionals/ aides.*	2.6 Follow-up Public School survey on Education Reform, 1998; National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1999.
	2.7 **Services to private school students.** By 2002, 60% of district and private school administrators will report effective implementation of on-site services to students as a result of the *Agostini v. Felton* court decision.		2.7 Baseline data will be reported through a planned study of Title I services to private school students (2000)
3. **Stimulate and accelerate state and local standards-based reform efforts and assistance to Title I schools .**	3.1 **Establishing annual progress measures:** By 2000, all States will adopt or develop measures of adequate progress linked to state performance standards that are substantially more rigorous than those used under the antecedent Chapter I program.	*All states are in the transitional period for final assessments and accountability Systems. In 1997, 25 states defined proficient student performance as being at least the 50th percentile on a norm-referenced test (nrt). 14 states require at least 90% or more of the students to attain the proficient performance level, and 13 states require proficiency in 10 years or less.*	3.1 Standards-Based Assessment and Accountability in American Education, draft; Analysis of state plans, ongoing.
	3.2 **Aligned assessments:** By 2000-01, all states will have assessments aligned with content and performance standards for core subjects.	*As of 1997, 14 states had assessments aligned to state content standards.*	3.2 Standards-Based Assessment and Accountability in American Education, draft; Analysis of state plans, ongoing.
	3.3 **Aligned curricula and materials:** By 2000, 60% of school districts receiving Title I funds will report that curricula and instructional materials in use in their schools are aligned with state content standards.	*In 1998, almost half of all school districts reported that Title I is "driving standards-based reform in the district as a whole" and more than 60 percent report that Title I is "driving standards-based reform in the highest poverty schools in the districts to at least a 'moderate' extent.*	3.3 Follow-up District Survey, draft.

Title I Grants for Schools Serving At-Risk Children--$7,996,020,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: At-risk students improve their achievement to meet challenging standards.

Relationship of Program to the Strategic Plan: Title I supports objectives 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, and 2.4 of the Department's strategic plan by funding services to enable at-risk students in low-income communities to meet challenging academic standards. It also helps build the capacity of schools in low-income communities to improve their performance through supporting standards and assessment development (objective 1.1), staff professional development (objective 1.4), family involvement (objective 1.5), and technology (objective 1.7).

Objective	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
	3.4 **Effective assistance**. States and districts will provide more effective assistance to schools not making progress through school support teams and other sources.	*In 1996, almost half of all districts reported that providing effective technical assistance to schools not making adequate yearly progress was moderately to very difficult.* *In 1998, 24 states reported that they had more schools in need of support team services than they have the capacity to provide.*	3.4 Baseline District Survey (Reports on Reform from the Field), 1997. Follow-up State Survey, draft.

Key Strategies

- Disseminate the findings from the National Research Council's reports, "Preventing Reading Difficulties," and "Starting Out Right" to all Title I Coordinators and to all Title I teachers. Use integrated review teams' follow-up stage to determine whether Title I teachers are using the research-based reading practices described in the reports in their classrooms.
- Disseminate new "Compact for Reading" guide to help parents and other care-givers reinforce reading instruction.
- Assist states and high-poverty school districts in the development, implementation, and refinement of aligned systems of standards, assessments, and accountability.
- Provide expert peer consultants and target technical assistance and dissemination efforts about standards, assessments, and accountability to those states and school systems that have the greatest need for assistance.
- Sponsor national, regional, and statewide forums that focus on moving content standards into the classroom, particularly in high-poverty schools.
- Work with Comprehensive Centers and Regional Labs to develop, disseminate and demonstrate various approaches that facilitate the transformation of state content standards into everyday teaching practice in Title I high-poverty schools across the nation.
- Disseminate research-based and promising practices of effective implementation of Title I provisions in order to accelerate the progress of districts and schools toward better student achievement, particularly in high-poverty and low-performing states, districts, and schools.
- Disseminate to all state and local education agencies information about how to use Title I and other federal program funds to support extended learning time programs.
- Initiate a study of the programs, policies, and practices in districts that provide good career development opportunities for teacher aides.
- Initiate studies that focus on implementation challenges and successes associated with aligned standards, assessment and accountability systems.
- Invite nationally recognized experts in alignment of curricula alignment to standards to work with Title I and Comprehensive Center staff to design a Resource Guide for alignment of curricula to standards.

Even Start Family Literacy Program--$145,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: **To help break the cycle of poverty and illiteracy by improving the educational opportunities of the Nation's low-income families, through a unified family literacy program that integrates early childhood education, adult literacy or adult basic education, and parenting education.**

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Even Start's activities support objective 2.1 (children enter school ready to learn), 2.2 (reading) and 3.4 (adult literacy) by providing model programs and supporting state and local implementation of the models. Because Even Start is focused on families most in need, it supports 2.4 (special populations). A central feature of Even Start is its involvement of families and its coordination of community services to provide services to its families - objective 1.5 (families and communities).

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
Participating families improve their literacy level			
1. **The literacy of participating families will improve.**	1.1 **Adult literacy achievement**. By fall 2001, 40% of Even Start adults will achieve significant learning gains on measures of math skills, and 30% of adults will achieve such gains on measures of reading skills.	*In 1995-96, 24% of adults achieved moderate to large gains between pretest and posttest on a test of math achievement, and 20% on a test of reading achievement.*	1.1 National Even Start Evaluation: experimental study, 2000.
	1.2 **Adult educational attainment.** By fall 2001, 25% of adult secondary education (ASE) Even Start participants will earn their high school diploma or equivalent.	*In 1995-96, 18% of all ASE/GED participants earned a GED.*	1.2 National Even Start Evaluation: universe study, 1999, experimental study, 2000.
	1.3 **Children's language development and reading readiness.** By fall 2001, 60% of Even Start children will achieve significant gains on measures of language development and reading readiness.	*In 1995-96, 81% of children achieved moderate to large gains on a test of school readiness, and 50% on a test of language development.*	1.3 National Even Start Evaluation: experimental study, 2000.
	1.4 **Parenting skills.** Increasing percentages of parents will show significant improvement on measures of parenting skills, home environment, and expectations for their children.	*In 1995-96, 41% of parents scored 75% or higher correct on the posttest measuring the quality of cognitive stimulation and emotional support provided to children in the home.*	1.4 National Even Start Evaluation: universe study, 1999, experimental study, 2000.
Even Start projects provide high-quality instructional and support services to families most in need			
2. **Even Start projects will reach their target population of families who are most in need of services.**	2.1 **Recruitment of most in need**. The projects will continue to recruit low-income, disadvantaged families with low literacy levels.	*In 1996-97, 90% of families had incomes at or substantially below the federal poverty level, and 45% of parents had less than a 9th grade education at intake.*	2.1 National Even Start Evaluation: universe study, 1999.

Even Start Family Literacy Program--$145,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: **To help break the cycle of poverty and illiteracy by improving the educational opportunities of the Nation's low-income families, through a unified family literacy program that integrates early childhood education, adult literacy or adult basic education, and parenting education.**

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Even Start's activities support objective 2.1 (children enter school ready to learn), 2.2 (reading) and 3.4 (adult literacy) by providing model programs and supporting state and local implementation of the models. Because Even Start is focused on families most in need, it supports 2.4 (special populations). A central feature of Even Start is its involvement of families and its coordination of community services to provide services to its families - objective 1.5 (families and communities).

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
3. Local Even Start projects will provide high-quality, comprehensive instructional and support services to all families in a cost-effective manner.	3.1 **Service hours**. By fall 2001, half of projects will offer at least 60 hours of adult education per month, 20 hours of parenting education per month, and 65 hours of early childhood education per month.	*In 1995-96, half of projects offered at least 32 hours of adult education per month, 13 hours of parenting education per month, and 34 hours of early childhood education per month.*	3.1 National Even Start Evaluation: universe study, 1999.
	3.2 **Participation, retention, and continuity**. Projects will increasingly improve retention and continuity of services. By fall 2001, at least 60% of new families will stay in the program for more than 1 year.	*Of new families entering in 1995-96, 41% stayed for more than 1 year.*	3.2 National Even Start Evaluation: universe study, 1999.
High-quality and customer-responsive federal administration			
4. The Department of Education will provide effective guidance and technical assistance and will identify and disseminate reliable information on effective approaches.	4.1 **Federal technical assistance.** An increasing percentage of local project directors will be satisfied with technical assistance and guidance.		4.1 National Even Start Evaluation: universe study, 1999.

Key Strategies

- Improve Even Start programs by identifying model projects and promising practices through the Staff Mentoring Sites project and high-quality evaluations; and by disseminating these practices through an Internet listserv, newsletters, and regional meetings; and by conducting an analysis and evaluation of costs associated with Even Start.
- Work with states to encourage targeting and serving families most in need of services by--
    - Disseminating models and discussing targeting issues at state coordinators' meetings, with a particular focus on increasing the intensity and continuity of service for highly mobile families and families in rural areas, such as through distance learning; and
    - Reviewing local applications during integrated reviews for statements on serving families most in need.

Migrant Education--$380,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To assist migrant students reach challenging standards. [Note that Objectives 1.1 and 1.2 rely on data that states are not mandated to supply until 2001.]

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: OME is designed to help migrant students to reach high standards. It addresses the Department's objective 2.4 (that special populations participate in appropriate services and assessments consistent with high standards), and objective 1.5 (that families and communities are fully involved in meeting this goal).

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
1. **Along with other federal programs and state and local reform efforts, the Migrant Education Program (MEP) will contribute to improved school performance of migrant children.**	1.1 **State and local assessments**. Increasing numbers of migrant students will meet or exceed the basic and proficient levels in state and local assessments (where in place).		1.1 Council of Chief States School Officers, State Education Indicators Report,1999; National Longitudinal Survey of Schools (NLSS), 1999; Consolidated State Performance Report, 1999.
	1.2 **Improved attention to assessment of migrant children**. The number of states that include migrant students in state assessments linked to high standards will increase, reaching all states that receive MEP funds in 2001.	*Number of states that included migrant students in their state assessment reports:* *1995-96, 11 states* *1996-97, 15 states & 1 territory*	1.2 Council of Chief States School Officers, State Education Indicator Survey, 1999.
2. **States and local districts will provide education services outside the regular school term to help migrant students achieve to high standards.**	2.1 **Summer education participation**. An increasing number of migrant children will be served by summer and inter-session programs.	*Numbers of summer participants:* *1995-96: 220,793* *1996-97: 283,026*	2.1 MEP State Performance Report, 1998; Fast Response Survey System (FRSS) of migrant summer school providers, 1999.
	2.2 **Extended learning opportunities.** The number of migrant out-of-school youth served during summer, inter-session, and extended time programs will increase.	*Numbers of out-of-school youth served in summer programs:* *1995-96: 7,593* *1996-97: 13,504.*	2.2 MEP State Performance Report, 1999.

62 63

Migrant Education--$380,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To assist migrant students reach challenging standards. [Note that Objectives 1.1 and 1.2 rely on data that states are not mandated to supply until 2001.]

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: OME is designed to help migrant students to reach high standards. It addresses the Department's objective 2.4 (that special populations participate in appropriate services and assessments consistent with high standards), and objective 1.5 (that families and communities are fully involved in meeting this goal).

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
3. The MEP will increase the efficiency and effectiveness of services to migrant children through more effective coordination at the state level.	3.1 **Interstate coordination.** States will demonstrate increased interstate coordination to improve educational continuity for migrant students by increasing the numbers of students served by states receiving incentive grants.	*Number of states receiving incentive grants:* *1995: 15* *1996: 23* *1997: 27* *1998: 32* *Number of students served by incentive states:* *1995: 22,000* *1996: 44,000*	3.1 Review of Consortium Incentive Grants, 1995 to 1999.
	3.2 **Family access to information.** The number of migrant families using the toll-free number will increase annually.	*The number of toll-free users was 10,717 in 1997-98.*	3.1 Usage reports from toll-free number coordination contract.
	3.4 **Program coordination.** District staff working with Title I, Part A and Part C, and other federally funded programs, will demonstrate increasing levels of collaboration as demonstrated by the number of Schoolwide Programs.	*The number of Schoolwide Programs combining MEP funds increased from 1,541 in academic year 1995-96 to 2,626 in academic year 1996-1997.*	3.4 MEP State Performance Report, 1998; *Meeting the Needs of Migrant Students in Schoolwide Programs* (1999); NLSS, 1999.
4. Encourage relationships between schools and families.	4.1 States will encourage and facilitate the participation of migrant parents in their children's education.	*6 states report increasing their focus on family involvement.*	4.1 Living in Interesting Times, Baseline Study of State Implementation, 1998, NLSS, 1999.
	4.2 More states and districts will form partnerships with businesses, community groups, and schools to encourage involvement of migrant parents.		4.2 Review of Consortium Incentive Grants, 1995 to 1999.
	4.3 More schools with migrant students will promote parent compacts.	*88% percent of Schoolwide Programs serving migrant students reported having a school-parent compact.*	4.3 Meeting the Needs of Migrant Students in Schoolwide Programs, (1999), NLSS, 1999.

Migrant Education--$380,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To assist migrant students reach challenging standards. [Note that Objectives 1.1 and 1.2 rely on data that states are not mandated to supply until 2001.]

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: OME is designed to help migrant students to reach high standards. It addresses the Department's objective 2.4 (that special populations participate in appropriate services and assessments consistent with high standards), and objective 1.5 (that families and communities are fully involved in meeting this goal).

Key Strategies

- Encourage states to coordinate their assessment procedures so that migrant children are included in state assessments that are linked to high standards.
- Examine assessment data from states that can disaggregate data by migrant status.
- Encourage states and districts to establish summer programs, inter-session programs, and extended day and school year programs for migrant children.
- Encourage states and districts to identify out-of-school migrant youth.
- Encourage states to form multi-state consortia to develop materials and implement procedures for use across multiple states.
- Support development and use of locator software to facilitate searches of state and regional databases to find and update records on migrant children.
- Establish and maintain substantive relationships with other federal programs, including Migrant Health (HHS) and Migrant Labor (JTPA).
- Provide technical assistance, through site visits, policy letters, meeting presentations, and other methods of communication, to better coordinate services to migrant students across programs.
- Establish Schoolwide Programs at schools enrolling migrant children, and encourage the blending of MEP funds and services with other program funds so that migrant children can benefit more fully.
- Encourage states and schools to encourage full participation and inclusion of migrant parents in the education of their children.
- Encourage states and districts to work with agribusiness and other local organizations to support education services and the work of migrant families and workers.
- Encourage states and districts to work with Title I, Part A, staff to include migrant parents in the Title I, Part A, outreach activities authorized by IASA.

Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected or Delinquent--$42,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To ensure that neglected and delinquent children and youth will have the opportunity to meet the challenging state standards needed to further their education and become productive members of society.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: This program is designed to improve the education and employment opportunities of neglected and delinquent students. It addresses the Department's objective 2.4 (that special populations participate in appropriate services and assessments consistent with high standards).

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
Improved Student Learning			
1. Neglected (N) and delinquent (D) students will improve academic and vocational skills needed to further their education or obtain employment.	1.2 **Progress and achievement.** An increasing number of states will show that N or D students are improving academic or vocational skills and educational attainment.		1.1 Analysis of program evaluations carried out by state agencies under Section 1431 of Part D, Subpart 3 of Title I, Part D, 1999.
2. Institutions and programs will demonstrate overall educational reform that better meets the needs of N, D, and at-risk children.	2.1 **Institution-wide programs.** Increased number of institutions will operate institution-wide programs that improve curriculum and instruction across the institution. 2.2 **Research-based curriculum and instructional practice.** States will use funds to implement comprehensive and research-based programs that focus on meeting the unique needs of N or D students.	Approximately 9% of N or D facilities are institution wide programs.	2.1 Title I state performance report, 1998. 2.2 State Agency Evaluation, 1999.
3. Programs will improve the ability of delinquent children and youth to make the transition from the institution to their community and society at large.	3.1 **Increased support for transition**. An increasing number of state-operated N or D programs will incorporate transition services and will track post-release progress of students.		3.1 Analysis of program evaluations carried out by state agencies under Section 1431 Subpart 3, of Title I, Part D, 1999. State Agency Evaluation, 1999.

Key Strategies

- Develop and disseminate guidance on conducting evaluations of N or D programs to state agencies.
- Conduct workshops to discuss promising practices in correctional education at major conferences, including the IASA conferences, the Title I conference, and the Correctional Education Association Meeting.

Demonstrations of Comprehensive School Reform—$150,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: **Enable low-performing students to improve their achievement to meet challenging standards.**

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: CSRD's activities support objective 1.1 (implement challenging standards), 2.2 (reading), 2.3 (math), and 3.1 (college preparation) by helping schools serving various grade levels implement effective, research-based, comprehensive reforms intended to raise student achievement. In addition to a focus on basic academics, CSRD supports objective 1.4 (professional development for teachers and staff), objective 1.5 (family involvement), and objective 1.3 (safe, strong, disciplined schools).

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
Low-performing students improve attendance and achievement			
1. **Student attendance and student achievement in core subjects generally will show marked improvement in Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration (CSRD) schools.**	1.1 **State and local assessments.** Increasing percentages of students in CSRD schools will meet or exceed the basic and proficient levels of performance on state and local assessments. 1.2 **Attendance.** Increasing percentages of students in CSRD schools will be in attendance daily.	*New program*	1.1 National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, Fall 1999 (*baseline*); 2000. 1.2 Analysis of annual state and local assessment results in CSRD schools in states with appropriate trend data, 1999 (*baseline*); 2000.
Schools provide high-quality education and improve performance			
2. **The number of participating schools providing high-quality curriculum and instruction will increase each year.**	2.1 **Research-based.** The number of CSRD schools implementing and sustaining comprehensive, research-based approaches to improve curriculum and instruction will increase annually.	*New program*	2.1 National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1999 (*baseline*) 2000
	2.2 **Implementation.** The number of CSRD schools meeting their objectives for implementation will increase annually.	*New program*	2.2 National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1999 (*baseline*); 2000.
	2.3 **School improvement.** Increasing numbers of CSRD schools will no longer be designated as schools in need of improvement by their states.	*New program*	2.3 National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1999 (*baseline*); 2000.
High-quality and customer-responsive federal administration			
3. **Federal leadership, assistance, and guidance in partnership with states and local districts will support school improvement and improved services to students**	3.1 **Useful guidance.** The percent of state and local program coordinators who report that comprehensive reform implementation guidance and other assistance are helpful will increase over time.	*In 1998 60% of state program coordinators said that written information (e.g., guidance, mailings) was very helpful in informing their understanding of the CSRD program.* *In 1998 49% of State program coordinators said that other contacts, such as conferences, workshops, on-line services, and telephone were very helpful in informing their understanding of the CSRD program.*	3.1 Follow-Up Study of State Implementation, 1999 (*baseline*), 2000. National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1999 (*baseline*); 2000.

Demonstrations of Comprehensive School Reform—$150,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: Enable low-performing students to improve their achievement to meet challenging standards.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: CSRD's activities support objective 1.1 (implement challenging standards), 2.2 (reading), 2.3 (math), and 3.1 (college preparation) by helping schools serving various grade levels implement effective, research-based, comprehensive reforms intended to raise student achievement. In addition to a focus on basic academics, CSRD supports objective 1.4 (professional development for teachers and staff), objective 1.5 (family involvement), and objective 1.3 (safe, strong, disciplined schools).

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
	3.2 **Impact on local understanding.** The number of districts and schools reporting knowledge and understanding of comprehensive school reform will increase annually.	*New program*	3.2 Local Implementation Study, 1998 *(baseline)*, 2000. National Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1999 *(baseline)*; 2000.

Key Strategies

- ❖ Support adoption of effective comprehensive reform programs by disseminating program guidance and information that help states, districts, and schools implement, evaluate, and support reform models and elements.
- ❖ Help schools and districts successfully implement comprehensive reform by working with states, regional education labs, comprehensive centers, and other providers of technical assistance to design and carry out effective technical assistance strategies.
- ❖ Work with professional organizations, technical assistance providers, and researchers to promote school-level improvement through adopting comprehensive research-based reform approaches for schools serving various grade levels and diverse populations.
- ❖ Establish a national directory of CSRD schools that will provide information for the national evaluation, and allow schools to network and share information and lessons as they develop, implement, and evaluate comprehensive school reform strategies.
- ❖ Use multiple means, including electronic media, to disseminate information on effective research-based programs and their implementation.
- ❖ Support school improvement in partnership with states by improving and promoting the CSRD home page; developing an Internet-based network to disseminate information and answer questions from CSR districts and schools; establishing Department of Education teams to assist schools and districts implementing CSR; initiating a high quality national evaluation of CSRD; and sharing lessons learned with states, districts, and schools.

High School Equivalency Program and College Assistance Migrant Program--$22,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: **To assist migrant and seasonal farm-worker students obtain the equivalent of a high school diploma and, subsequently, to begin postsecondary education, enter military service, or get a job.**

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: OME's programs are designed to improve the achievement levels of older migrant students. They address objective 2.4 (special populations participate in appropriate services and assessments consistent with high standards), objective 3.1 (that secondary school students get the support they need to prepare for postsecondary education), and objective 3.2 (that postsecondary students get the support they need to complete their educational program).

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
High School Equivalency Program (HEP)			
1. **An increasing percentage of HEP participants will complete the program and receive their GED.**	1.1 **GED completion**. The percentage of HEP participants who complete the program and receive the GED will continue to remain high, if not increase, in comparison with other, similar populations and programs.	*In 1993-94, 69% of HEP participants earned the GED, as compared with 30% of national participants in Level II Adult Education.*	1.1 HEP/CAMP Association reports (1995, et seq.); data from grantee competitive applications (1993); Performance Reports (submitted for non-competing continuations) (1994-99); Data from other programs (e.g., Adult Education, Student Support Services).
2. **An increasing percentage of HEP participants will begin postsecondary education, enter military service, or get a job.**	2.1 **Postsecondary entrance**. The percentage of HEP participants with a GED who enroll in postsecondary programs will either equal or exceed the percentage achieved the previous year.		2.1 Performance Reports (submitted for non-competing continuations) (1994-99).
College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP)			
3. **All CAMP students will complete their first academic year at a postsecondary institution in good standing.**	3.1 **Academic achievement**. The percentage of CAMP participants who successfully complete the first year of an academic or postsecondary education program (CAMP services are provided just for the first year) will either equal or exceed that achieved the previous year.	*In 1993-94, 96% of CAMP participants completed their first academic year in good standing at an institution of higher education.*	3.1 HEP/CAMP Association reports (1995, et seq.); data from grantee competitive applications (1993); Performance Reports (submitted for non-competing continuations) (1994-99).
4. **CAMP students will graduate from 4-year colleges or universities at higher rates.**	4.1 **Student graduation**. The percentage of former CAMP participants who complete a postsecondary degree program will be as high as that achieved by all former adult-secondary level students or higher.	*In 1993-94, 74% of former CAMP participants had graduated from college, compared with 8 % of all Hispanics ages 18-38.*	4.1 HEP/CAMP Association reports 1995; data from other programs (e.g., Adult Education, Student Support Services).

High School Equivalency Program and College Assistance Migrant Program--$22,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: **To assist migrant and seasonal farm-worker students obtain the equivalent of a high school diploma and, subsequently, to begin postsecondary education, enter military service, or get a job.**

Relation of Program to Strategic Plan: OME's programs are designed to improve the achievement levels of older migrant students. They address the following objectives: special populations participate in appropriate services and assessments consistent with high standards (2.4); that secondary school students get the support they need to prepare for postsecondary education (3.1); and that postsecondary students get the support they need to complete their educational program (3.2).

Key Strategies

- OESE will promote greater coordination of HEP with the MEP and with other adult education, high school completion, and dropout prevention programs administered by OVAE and OPE.
- OESE will work with HEP projects to collect standardized information on participant outcomes and activities.
- Propose statutory changes to strengthen preparation for postsecondary education and to better target program services on those persons engaged in seasonal farm-work or currently eligible for services as migrant or seasonal farm-workers under the MEP or JTPA Section 402 program.
- OESE will promote coordination of CAMP with the MEP and other relevant OPE programs (e.g., TRIO).
- OESE will work with CAMP projects to collect standardized information on participant outcomes and activities.
- Propose statutory changes to improve targeting of CAMP services on those persons currently eligible for services as migrant or seasonal farm-workers under the MEP or JTPA Section 402 program.

School Improvement and Other Elementary/Secondary Programs (Impact Aid, Class Size, Reading Excellence, and Indian Education)

Impact Aid--$736,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To provide appropriate financial assistance for federally connected children who present a genuine burden to their school districts.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: The Impact Aid program supports objective 1.3 of the Department's Strategic Plan. The program provides support to school districts that are affected by federal activities.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Sources, Periodicity, Next Update
Basic Support Payments, Payments for Children with Disabilities, and Payments for Heavily Impacted Districts			
1. Make payments in a timely manner.	1.1 **Timeliness of payments.** At least 90% of eligible applicants will receive initial Basic Support and Disabilities payments within 60 days after the enactment of an appropriation.	*1997: 75%* *1998: 87%* *1999: 13% (payments have now been made; were delayed by implementation of new Y2K-compliant system)*	1.1 An annual application and payment file, program office analyses; next update 2000.
2. Make accurate payments.	2.1 **Overpayment forgiveness requests.** The annual number of requests to forgive overpayments of Basic Support payments, Disabilities payments, and Heavily Impacted payments will not exceed 10.	*1998: 4 requests (compared to approximately 2,500 school districts receiving Basic Support Payments)*	2.1 Program office analyses; next update 1999.
3. Improve consultation between school districts and the Indian community to support the education of Indian children.	3.1 **Indian community consultation.** At least 75% of Title IX coordinators in school districts that receive Impact Aid will report that the district solicits input from the Indian community on strategies for increasing the achievement of Indian children.		3.1 Title IX Performance Reports; baseline data available spring 2000.
Facilities			
4. Continue to maintain, repair, renovate, and transfer school facilities owned by the Department of Education.	4.1 **Facility transfers.** At least 2 school facilities will be removed annually from the inventory of facilities owned by the Department.	*1996: 4 removals* *1997: 2 removals* *1998: 3 removals*	4.1 Program files; next update 1999.

80

81

Impact Aid--$736,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To provide appropriate financial assistance for federally connected children who present a genuine burden to their school districts.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: The Impact Aid program supports objective 1.3 of the Department's Strategic Plan. The program provides support to school districts that are affected by federal activities.

Key Strategies

- Propose formula changes through legislation and appropriations language to ensure that funds are directed to districts serving federally connected children for whom the federal government has a primary obligation.
- Improve review procedures.
- Implement new payment system on Windows 95 platform with more sophisticated capabilities.
- Continue quality control processes to minimize payment errors.
- Provide increased technical assistance to school districts to support Indian community consultation requirements.
- Propose language for the ESEA reauthorization to strengthen the Indian community consultation requirements and increase accountability for the use of Impact Aid funds for Indian children.
- Work with OIE to implement the Executive Order on American Indian and Alaskan Native Education.
- The Department has requested funding to maintain in a safe condition school buildings owned by the Department and to fund a limited number of renovation and transfer projects in the FY 1999 budget.
- Continue negotiations with school districts to ensure timely transfer of facilities.
- Continue cooperative efforts with the Department of Defense to encourage the transfer of facilities to school districts.
- Request funding under section 8007 targeted to Impact Aid districts in which at least 50% of the children live on Indian lands.

Eisenhower Professional Development Program--$335,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To improve the quality of classroom teaching through professional development.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: The Eisenhower Professional Development Program supports Objective 1.4 (A talented and dedicated teacher is in every classroom in America) and Objective 2.3 (Every eight-grader masters challenging mathematics, including the foundations of algebra and geometry) by supporting grants to States, districts, institutions of higher education and non-profit organizations for standards-based professional development. The program places a priority on math and science professional development.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Sources, Periodicity, Next Update
1. **Classroom instruction is improved through effective professional development .**	1.1 **Teachers' skills and classroom instruction.** By 1998, over 50% of a sample of teachers will show evidence that participation in Eisenhower-assisted professional development improved their knowledge and skills. By 2000, over 60% will show such evidence. By 1999, over 50% of a sample of teachers in selected sites will show evidence that participation in Eisenhower-assisted professional development has improved classroom instruction.	*Preliminary data from the national evaluation indicate that, in 1998, about 66% of teachers who participated in district-level Eisenhower activities reported that the activities enhanced their knowledge and skills in "instructional methods." About 58% of the teachers reported that the activities enhanced their knowledge and skills in curriculum content.*	1.1 Final data to be published in National Evaluation of the Eisenhower Program Report, 1999. (Note: Final numbers may be slightly different from these preliminary numbers in the "performance data" column due to further analyses and the addition of a small number of late responders to the survey sample.)
2. **High-quality professional development and state policy are aligned with high state content and student performance standards.**	2.1 **District-level professional development.** By 1998, over 50% of teachers participating in district-level or higher education Eisenhower-assisted professional development will participate in activities that are aligned with high standards.. By 2000, over 75% will.	*Preliminary data from the national evaluation indicate that in 1998 about 56% of teachers who participated in district-level Eisenhower activities and 59% of teachers who participated in higher education Eisenhower activities reported that participation enhanced their capacity to implement standards.*	2.1 Data to be published in National Evaluation of the Eisenhower Program Report, 1999. (Note: Final numbers may be slightly different from these preliminary numbers in "performance data" column due to further analyses and the addition of a small number of late responders to the survey sample.)
3. **Professional development is sustained, intensive, and high-quality and has a lasting impact on classroom instruction.**	3.1 **High quality.** By 1998, over 50% of teachers participating in district-level, Eisenhower-assisted professional development activities will participate in activities reflecting best practices, including a focus on continuous improvement. By 2000, over 75% will.	*Preliminary data from the national evaluation indicate that in 1998 about 52% of teachers in Eisenhower district-level activities reported that the activities placed a major emphasis on deepening content knowledge--67% of teachers in IHE/NPO Eisenhower activities reported such emphasis.*	3.1 Data to be published in National Evaluation of Eisenhower Program Report, 1999. (Note: Final numbers may be slightly different from these preliminary numbers in "performance data" column due to further analyses and the addition of a small number of late responders to the survey sample.)

Eisenhower Professional Development Program--$335,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To improve the quality of classroom teaching through professional development.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: The Eisenhower Professional Development Program supports Objective 1.4 (A talented and dedicated teacher is in every classroom in America) and Objective 2.3 (Every eight-grader masters challenging mathematics, including the foundations of algebra and geometry) by supporting grants to States, districts, institutions of higher education and non-profit organizations for standards-based professional development. The program places a priority on math and science professional development.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Sources, Periodicity, Next Update
	3.2 **Sustained professional development.** By 1998, 35% of teachers participating in district-level Eisenhower-assisted activities will participate in activities that are a component of professional development that extends over the school year; by 2000, over 50% will.	*Preliminary data show that about 31 % of teachers participating in district-level Eisenhower activities were in activities lasting longer than 1 month. About 61% of teachers in higher education Eisenhower activities engaged in activities that lasted longer than 1 month.*	3.2 Data to be published in National Evaluation of Eisenhower Program Report, 1999. (Note: Final numbers may be slightly different from these preliminary numbers in "performance data" column due to further analyses and the addition of a small number of late responders to the survey sample.)
4. High-quality professional development is provided to teachers who work with disadvantaged populations.	4.1 **High-poverty schools.** The proportion of teachers participating in Eisenhower-assisted activities who teach in high-poverty schools will exceed the proportion of the national teacher pool who teach in high-poverty schools.		4.1 Data to be published in National Evaluation of the Eisenhower Program Report, 1999.
	4.2 **Context (not limited to any single program): Teachers.** Teachers in high-poverty schools will participate in intensive, sustained, high-quality professional development at rates comparable with, or higher than, the rates for teachers in other schools.	*The 1994 SASS shows that 36% of teachers in high-poverty public schools participated in professional development programs focusing on in-depth study in their subject field, compared with 30% of teachers in low-poverty schools.* *Data from the 1999 NCES Teacher Quality Report show that teachers from high and low poverty schools participate in professional development focused on in-depth study in their subject field at comparable rates.*	4.2 NCES Schools & Staffing Survey (SASS), 1999-2000.

Eisenhower Professional Development Program--$335,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To improve the quality of classroom teaching through professional development.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: The Eisenhower Professional Development Program supports Objective 1.4 (A talented and dedicated teacher is in every classroom in America) and Objective 2.3 (Every eight-grader masters challenging mathematics, including the foundations of algebra and geometry) by supporting grants to States, districts, institutions of higher education and non-profit organizations for standards-based professional development. The program places a priority on math and science professional development.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Sources, Periodicity, Next Update
5. Effective management of the Eisenhower Program at the federal, state, and local levels supports systemic reform.	5.1 **Federal guidance and assistance.** The number of Eisenhower state coordinators who report that the Department's guidance and assistance are timely and helpful will increase.	*In a 1998 survey, 43 (86%) of the Eisenhower state coordinators reported that written guidance from the Department has been either "very helpful" or "helpful," and 42 states (84%) reported that other contacts with ED have been either "very helpful" or "helpful." Twenty-six (52%) states reported that information from the Department has been "timely," and 12 states (24%) reported that that such information was "very timely."*	5.1 The Follow-Up Study of State Implementation of Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Programs, 1998. Data source for 2000 is under development. (Note: Final numbers may be slightly different from these preliminary numbers in "performance data" column due to further analyses.)
6. Measurement of integrated planning and collaboration.	6.1 By 1998, 50% of all states will have developed performance indicators for integrated professional development across programs (including Eisenhower) in order to support systemic reform and will have data collection systems in place; by 2000, 75% will have.	*As of 1998, 30 states (60%) had developed professional development indicators under the Eisenhower requirement, but only 8 states had developed them jointly with other programs. ED is in the process of extensively reviewing the indicators provided by states on the Triennial Performance Report forms to assess whether more states have integrated indicators across programs.*	6.1 The Follow-up Study of State Implementation of Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Programs, 1998. By March of 1999, the Department will have completed an extensive review of the Triennial Performance Reports. (The source of data for the year 2000 target is under development.)
	6.2 By 2000, over 80% of states will report that they coordinate and collaborate with Title I state coordinators when they develop their plans for professional development.		6.2 The source of data for the year 2000 target is under development.

Eisenhower Professional Development Program--$335,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To improve the quality of classroom teaching through professional development.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: The Eisenhower Professional Development Program supports Objective 1.4 (A talented and dedicated teacher is in every classroom in America) and Objective 2.3 (Every eight-grader masters challenging mathematics, including the foundations of algebra and geometry) by supporting grants to States, districts, institutions of higher education and non-profit organizations for standards-based professional development. The program places a priority on math and science professional development.

Key Strategies

- Promote effective professional development as described in the Department's Mission and Principles of High-Quality Professional Development. For example, encourage standards-based activities and the use of measurable outcomes. Use the National Eisenhower Evaluation Conference for State Eisenhower coordinators as a forum for providing technical assistance and for promoting these ideas.
- Review the performance indicator information that states provide on Triennial Performance Reports and develop and provide technical assistance to states on indicators in accordance with that review. Promote strategies that help states to work with their local school districts in developing local indicators that are tied to standards developed by professional organizations such as the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) and National Research Council (NRC). (Example: TIMSS technical assistance workshops.)
- Through technical assistance workshops, ensure accurate interpretation of the program statute, including new requirements and their implementation at the state and local levels.
- Help states use their indicator system to promote needs-based plans that take into consideration professional development for teachers who work with disadvantaged populations.
- Disseminate information and provide technical assistance to Eisenhower state coordinators on aligning professional development with high state content and student performance standards.
- Develop strategies for states to share effective practices in standards-based professional development that reflect high-quality research-based teaching. (Example: Share-a-Thon sessions at conferences.)
- Through technical assistance workshops, program guidance, and ED's integrated review team (IRT) visits, encourage the states to adopt and report on strategies that promote professional development activities that extend over the school year and address the States' reform efforts. Through the same processes, ensure accurate interpretation of the program statute, including new requirements and ways to implement them at the state and local levels.
- Assist in the implementation of the approved the Department's and the National Science Foundation's joint Action Plan for Improving Mathematics.
- Through written and oral communications, stress the need for Title II coordinators to work with Title I staff and to get teachers from high-poverty schools and underrepresented populations involved in high-quality professional development.
- Work with Eisenhower State Agency for Higher Education (SAHE) coordinators to focus some of their grants on professional development and support for beginning teachers.

Innovative Education Program Strategies (Block Grant) (Title VI, ESEA)–$0 (FY 2000)

Goal: To support state and local efforts to accomplish promising education reform programs.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Innovative Education Program Strategies (Title VI) enables local educational agencies to deploy resources in eight categories designed to improve educational opportunities in areas such as help for at-risk children, programs to increase parental involvement, enhanced library services, and professional development for teachers. Because Title VI can be broadly applied by superintendents and principals, it meets the majority of the strategic plan objectives.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Sources, Periodicity, Next Update
1. **Increase the percentage of Title VI-funded activities that support local education reform efforts.**	1.1 **Reform efforts.** The use of Title VI funds will show that the activities supported are integral to achieving district reform plans.	*In 1998, 52 percent of the Title VI district coordinators reported that the district's long-term reform plan influenced how Title VI funds were used.* *Title VI funds are predominantly used by districts to acquire educational materials, including library materials and software (58%) and to expand the use of technology (39%).*	1.1 Title VI Biennial Reports, 1999; Education Resources and Federal Funding, 1999.
2. **Effective management of the Title VI program supports systemic reform at the federal, state and local levels.**	2.1 **Quality ED service.** State education agencies will report that technical assistance and other services provided by ED and federal assistance providers are useful and of high quality.	*In 1997-98, 21 Title VI State Coordinators reported that written guidance from ED was very useful in informing their understanding of federal legislative provisions for Title VI; 14 reported that other contacts with ED (e.g., conferences, workshops, on-line services, telephone) were very useful in informing their understanding of the provisions; 21 reported that ED's strategy for conducting integrated reviews will be or has been somewhat useful to implementing Title VI to support comprehensive standards-based reform.*	2.1 Baseline Crosscutting Survey of State Implementation of Federal Programs, 1998; Follow-up Crosscutting State Survey, 1999.
	2.2. **Quality State implementation**. Surveys of states will show that Title VI state coordination, monitoring, and assistance are effective in integrating Title VI into state reform agendas	*Twenty-six state Title VI coordinators reported that their state has conducted integrated monitoring visits that address their program and other federal or state programs.*	

Innovative Education Program Strategies (Block Grant) (Title VI, ESEA)--$0 (FY 2000)

Goal: To support state and local efforts to accomplish promising education reform programs.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Innovative Education Program Strategies (Title VI) enables local educational agencies to deploy resources in eight categories designed to improve educational opportunities in areas such as help for at-risk children, programs to increase parental involvement, enhanced library services, and professional development for teachers. Because Title VI can be broadly applied by superintendents and principals, it meets the majority of the strategic plan objectives.

Key Strategies

- Make presentations at regional and national meetings to assist Title VI coordinators in ensuring that program funds are used in a manner consistent with state and local reform plans.
- Provide coordinators with information on activities, aligned with the purposes of the program, that have been proved effective.
- Ensure that technical assistance and other services by ED staff are useful and of high quality by responding to feedback provided by state and local program administrators during ED Integrated Review Team visits.
- Continue professional development of Office of Elementary and Secondary employees to develop expertise in principles and practices of education reform.

Class-Size Reduction Program--$1,400,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: Reduce average class size nationally, particularly in the early grades, to improve student achievement.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: The Class-Size Reduction Program directly supports objective 3.1 (safe, disciplined schools) by providing a conducive learning environment. The program supports objective 1.4 (a talented teacher in every classroom) by providing teacher training for small classes. The program also supports objectives 2.1 (children start school ready to learn) and 2.2 (every child reading by the third grade) by enabling more individual attention in the early grades.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
1. **To improve student achievement.**	1.1 **State/ local assessments.** Increasing percentages of 4th graders at schools receiving program funds will score at basic, proficient, or advanced levels in reading on state or local assessments.	*New program*	1.1 National Evaluation, 2000. LEA report cards, 2000.
2. **To reduce average class size nationally in grades 1-3.**	2.1 **Additional teachers hired.** By 2005, school districts will hire 100,000 additional teachers above those expected to be hired without the program.	*New program*	2.1 State applications, 1999.
	2.2 **Number of students per class.** Local school districts will reduce the maximum or average number of students per class in grades 1-3 so that the national average class size will be 18 by 2005.	*In 1993-94, the average class size in grades 1-3 was 21.9 students.*	2.2 State applications, 1999. Schools and Staffing Survey, 1998-99. State performance reports, annual, 2001.
3. **To ensure that newly hired and existing teachers are highly qualified and certified.**	3.1 **Increased professional development.** Increasing percentages of teachers in grades 1-3 will complete intensive professional development.	*New program*	3.1 State performance reports, annual, 2001.
	3.2 **Improved preparation for teaching reading in small classes.** Increasing percentages of teachers in grades 1-3 will receive intensive professional development in effective teaching methods in small classes.		3.2 State performance reports, annual, 2001.

Key Strategies

- Work with states to distribute grant money by July 1, 1999.
- Collaborate with the Department's existing programs (such as the Eisenhower Professional Development Program) to improve pre-service and in-service professional development for teachers through regular meetings with program staff to share existing, and acquire new, information.
- Encourage state and local education agencies to share effective and creative approaches to teacher availability, limited classroom/building space, certification requirements, collective bargaining agreements and other issues through facilitated workshops and the development by the Class-Size Reduction team of a publication that contains information on such approaches.
- Build data collection about the early implementation of the program into the application package so that timely information on the initial impact can be generated.

Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program—State Grants Program and National Programs (FY 2000)

Goal: To help ensure that all schools are safe, disciplined, and drug free by promoting implementation of high-quality drug and violence prevention programs.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Safe and Drug-Free Schools State Grant Program and National Programs support objective 1.3 (schools are strong, safe, disciplined, and drug-free) by providing funds through formula and discretionary grants to states, governors' offices, and other grantees in support of school-based drug and violence prevention activities and services to create and maintain drug-free, safe, and orderly learning environments.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Sources, Periodicity, Next Update
Outcomes			
1. **Reduce the use and availability of alcohol and drugs in schools.**	1.1 **Drug use in schools.** By 2001: ➢ Rates of annual alcohol use in schools will decline to 4% for 8th graders and 7% for 10th and 12th graders. ➢ Rates of annual marijuana use in school for the same time period will decline to 3%, 9%, and 7% for 8th, 10th, and 12th graders.	*Rate of annual alcohol use in school:* *8th grade 10th grade 12th grade* *1996: 6% 9% 8%* *1997: 5% 8% 8%* *1998: 6% 8% 8%* *Rate of annual marijuana and other drug use in school:* *8th grade 10th grade* *1996: 6% 11%* *1997: 5% 11%* *1998: 5% 9%** **Goal met* *Rate of annual marijuana use in school:* *12th grade* *1996: 10%* *1997: 10%* *1998: 8%** **Goal met*	1.1 Monitoring the Future (MTF), 1999 (students in grades 8, 10, and 12).

Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program—State Grants Program and National Programs (FY 2000)

Goal: To help ensure that all schools are safe, disciplined, and drug free by promoting implementation of high-quality drug and violence prevention programs.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Safe and Drug-Free Schools State Grant Program and National Programs support objective 1.3 (schools are strong, safe, disciplined, and drug-free) by providing funds through formula and discretionary grants to states, governors' offices, and other grantees in support of school-based drug and violence prevention activities and services to create and maintain drug-free, safe, and orderly learning environments.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Sources, Periodicity, Next Update
2. Reduce number of criminal and violent incidents in schools.	**2.1 Serious violent incidents in schools.** By 2001: ➢ The proportion of high school students in a physical fight on school property will decrease to 12%. ➢ The annual rate of students ages 12 to 18 who report experiencing serious violent crime in school, or going to and from school, will decrease to 8 per 1,000.	➢ Percentage of high school students who reported being involved in a physical fight on school property in the past year: 1995: 16% 1997: 15% ➢ Rate of students ages 12 to 18 who reported experiencing serious violent crime in schools, or going to and from school: 1995: 11 per 1,000 1996: 10 per 1,000 1997: [rate not yet available]	2.1 ➢ Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS), Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, (CDC) 1999. ➢ National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), 1999.
	2.2 Weapons in schools. By 2001, the proportion of high school students carrying weapons (including firearms) to school will decrease to 6%.	Percentage of high school students who reported carrying a weapon on school property in the previous 30 days: 1995 10% 1997 9%	2.2 YRBS 1999 .
	2.3 School-related homicides. For the 2-year period ending in 2001, the number of school-related homicides will decline to 64.	*CDC/ED study: 85 school-associated homicides were reported between 1992-1993 and 1993-1994.*	2.3 CDC/ED Study, 1999.
3. Reduce alcohol and drug use among school-age youth.	**3.1 Drug use by school-aged children**. By 2000: ➢ Rates of 30-day prevalence of alcohol use will decline to 21% for 8th graders, 32% for 10th graders, and 41% for 12th graders. ➢ Rates of 30-day prevalence of illicit drug use will decline to 12% for 8th graders, 19% for 10th graders, and 20% for 12th graders.	➢ *Rate of 30 day alcohol use:* *8th grade 10th grade 12th grade* *1996: 26% 40% 51%* *1997: 25% 40% 53%* *1998: 23% 39% 52%* ➢ *Rate of 30 day illicit drug use:* *8th grade 10th grade 12th grade* *1996: 15% 23% 25%* *1997: 13% 23% 26%* *1998: 12% 22% 26%*	3.1 MTF, 1999.

Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program—State Grants Program and National Programs (FY 2000)

Goal: **To help ensure that all schools are safe, disciplined, and drug free by promoting implementation of high-quality drug and violence prevention programs.**

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Safe and Drug-Free Schools State Grant Program and National Programs support objective 1.3 (schools are strong, safe, disciplined, and drug-free) by providing funds through formula and discretionary grants to states, governors' offices, and other grantees in support of school-based drug and violence prevention activities and services to create and maintain drug-free, safe, and orderly learning environments.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Sources, Periodicity, Next Update
High quality programs and services			
4. Help school districts select and implement programs that have been evaluated and found to be effective.	4.1 **Increase pool of promising and exemplary programs.** By 2002, identify 20 drug and violence prevention programs that have been rigorously evaluated and found to be either promising or exemplary, as defined by an expert panel.		4.1 Results of review process by Expert Panel on Safe and Drug-Free Schools, 1999.
5. Help school districts align their programs with the SDFS Principles of Effectiveness for Prevention Programs through both state formula grants and National Programs. Programs must be tied to a needs assessment, have goals that are measurable and tied to outcomes, be research based, and be evaluated periodically.	5.1 **Principles of effectiveness**. By 2001, all school districts will use prevention programs that are consistent with the SDFS Principles of Effectiveness.		5.1 ED Local Educational Agency Survey (LEA Survey), 1999
	5.2 **Coordinators**. By 2001, all drug prevention and school safety coordinators funded by the middle-school coordinator initiative will have received training to implement effective, research-based programs.		5.2 Planned evaluation to begin with coordinator initiative in FY 1999.
6. Improve the quality and use of state and local performance data through both the state formula grant program and National Programs.	6.1 **State surveys**. By 1999, all states will conduct periodic statewide surveys or collect statewide data on student alcohol and drug use and incidents of crime and violence in schools.	*For school year 1996-1997, 49 states conducted periodic surveys or collected statewide data on student alcohol and other drug use, and 39 states collected information on crime and violence in schools.*	6.1 ED/SDFS Survey, 1998.
	6.2 **Approval of district applications**. By 1998, all states will use performance indicators to make decisions regarding approval of applications from districts for FY 1997 funding.		6.2 SDFS State Reports, 1999.
	6.3 **District program improvement**. By 1999, all districts will routinely use performance indicators to determine whether activities should be continued or modified.		6.3 LEA Survey, 1999.

Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program—State Grants Program and National Programs (FY 2000)

Goal: To help ensure that all schools are safe, disciplined, and drug free by promoting implementation of high-quality drug and violence prevention programs.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Safe and Drug-Free Schools State Grant Program and National Programs support objective 1.3 (schools are strong, safe, disciplined, and drug-free) by providing funds through formula and discretionary grants to states, governors' offices, and other grantees in support of school-based drug and violence prevention activities and services to create and maintain drug-free, safe, and orderly learning environments.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Sources, Periodicity, Next Update
7 **Provide crisis intervention assistance to school districts.**	7.1 **Crisis intervention.** By 2000, the Department will establish the organization structure necessary to provide timely, targeted assistance to school districts seriously affected by crises that interfere with learning.	*No such formal structure has been established as of 1998.*	**7.1** Review of program files and organizational plans.

Key Strategies

- Identify and publicize promising prevention programs and strategies through the Expert Panel project, in coordination with the Department of Health and Human Services, to identify exemplary and promising prevention programs, and through the redesigned Recognition Program to identify schools implementing exemplary/promising strategies.
- Produce Annual Report Card, in coordination with the U.S. Department of Justice, to enhance public awareness about the nature and character of school violence and to identify effective practices.
- Implement SDFS Principles of Effectiveness that require program funds be used for data-driven, research-based programs.
- Continue to monitor the implementation of Demonstration Grants to test and identify program suitable for replication in other school sites.
- Implement the School Emergency Response to Violence (SERV) initiative to provide crisis intervention services to districts seriously affected by traumatic events that disrupt learning.
- Support the Higher Education Center for Campus-Based Drug and Violence Prevention Programs.

Inexpensive Book Distribution--$18,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To provide programs that promote literacy skills and motivate children to read, including the distribution of inexpensive books to children.

Relation of Program to Strategic Plan: The Inexpensive Book Distribution program supports objective 2.2 of the Department's Strategic Plan, by distributing books and other activities to motivate and help children read well.

Objective	Indicator	Performance Data	Sources, Periodicity, Next Update
1. Support the goals of the America Reads Challenge and the U.S. Department of Education's priority of having children read independently and well by the end of the grade 3; and support and promote literacy development through grade 12, through Reading Is Fundamental (RIF) projects.	1.1 **Increased numbers of children served and books distributed by RIF projects.** The numbers of children served and books distributed by RIF projects will increase annually.	*In FY 1997, RIF served 1,982,000 children and distributed 6,343,000 books. In FY 1998, RIF served 3,334,965 children and distributed 10,549,963 books.*	1.1 Performance reports, annual, 1999, 2000.
	1.2 **Financial self-sufficiency.** In order to use federal funds to support the implementation of additional local RIF projects, the federal share of funds that support existing RIF projects will decrease over time.	*In FY 2000, RIF will develop baseline data detailing the numbers of successful, continuing projects that no longer need federal support.*	1.2 Performance reports, annual, 2000.
	1.3 **Promote community literacy efforts.** RIF projects will increasingly engage in partnership activities and work to promote broad-based community support for, and involvement in, literacy projects.	*In FY 1998, RIF projects developed partnerships with 96 associations and organizations across the country, for community support and involvement in literacy projects.*	1.3 Performance reports, annual, 1998..
2. Serve children with special needs through Reading Is Fundamental (RIF) projects. ***Children with special needs are defined as children at risk of school failure, disabled and homeless children, children of migrant families, institutionalized and incarcerated children, or children of institutionalized or incarcerated parents.***	2.1 **Children with special needs.** An increasing percentage of children served by RIF will be those with special needs.	*In FY 1998, approximately 69% of children served by RIF projects had special needs*	2.1 Performance reports, annual, 1998.

Key Strategies

- ❖ Encourage RIF projects that broaden and strengthen community partnerships in order to ensure lasting financial independence and sufficiency.
- ❖ Encourage RIF projects to coordinate its efforts with local Title I, Migrant Education, Even Start, and America Reads Challenge: Read*Write*Now programs.
- ❖ Provide technical assistance and advice to RIF on effective ways that these projects can use to reach under-served, at-risk, and children with special needs.
- ❖ Encourage RIF to coordinate its efforts with local Title I, Migrant Education, Even Start, and America Reads Challenge: Read*Write*Now programs.

Arts Education--$10,500,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To promote, improve, and enhance arts education and cultural activities for elementary and secondary students.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: The Arts in Education Program supports objectives 1.1(challenging standards) and 2.4 (at-risk populations). The program provides financial support for high-quality arts education that can help motivate all children, including members of high-risk groups, to learn to high standards.

Objective	Indicator	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
1. Activities supported with federal funds will serve an increasing proportion of students with disabilities or students who would not otherwise have access to cultural activities.	1.1 **Outreach.** Projects supported by the Kennedy Center will reach a greater number of communities, particularly in urban, rural, and socioeconomically disadvantaged areas. Targets to be set in 1999. 1.2 **Outreach**. Very Special Arts will expand the number of affiliates and partnerships that it supports to provide arts education. Use of technology will increase access to the arts for students with disabilities. Targets to be set in December 1999.		1.1 Performance reports, annual, 1999. 1.2 Performance reports, annual, 1999.
2. Kennedy Center activities will improve the quality of arts education programs by assisting professional development and the development of curriculum materials.	2.1 **Quality of services.** Projects supported by the Kennedy Center will create, revise, and disseminate high-quality professional development activities and curriculum materials tied to challenging standards annually. Targets to be set in 1999.		2.1 Performance reports, annual, 1999.

Key Strategies

- Provide technical assistance and advice to grantees on effective ways to reach students who are under-served, at-risk, and have special needs.
- Provide information to grantee about effective teacher training practices.
- Provide arts education resources, developed by grantees, to schools through the use of technology.

Magnet Schools Assistance Program--$114,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To assist in the desegregation of schools served by local education agencies.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: The Magnet Schools Assistance Program supports objectives 1.1, 1.6, and 3.1 of the Department's Strategic Plan. The program provides financial assistance for high-quality public school choice options that are accessible to all children. The objectives are concerned with how well the program is serving the children enrolled in magnet schools, and the extent to which the program is enabling public school districts to reduce racial isolation of among and within schools. The program contributes to state and local systemic reforms, the provision of high-quality teaching and learning experiences, and the improvement of student achievement.

Objective	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
1. **Federally funded magnet programs eliminate, reduce, or prevent the incidence and/or the degree of minority student isolation in targeted schools.**	**Targeted school** 1.1 **Minority group isolation:** Targeted schools will *eliminate*, *reduce*, or *prevent* minority group isolation according to their objective. Specific objectives of FY '98 funded schools: *11% of schools* – prevent minority group isolation (MGI) *13% of schools* – eliminate MGI *57% of schools* – reduce MGI *3% of schools* – prevent, reduce, or eliminate MGI in feeder school *16% of schools* – objective to be classified		1.1 MSAP annual project reports, beginning September 1999 (end of the first year of the three year project cycle); MSAP evaluation, 2000.
	1.2 **Minority/non-minority distribution.** Magnet curricular activities generally will reflect the same minority/non-minority distribution as the magnet school (or program within school).		1.2 Analysis of 1998 MSAP applications in 1999; MSAP annual project reports, 1999; MSAP evaluation, 2000.
2. **Federally funded magnet programs or innovative programs promote national, state, and local systemic reforms and are aligned with challenging state content and student performance standards.**	2.2 **National, state, and local reforms.** Project designs will provide evidence that the magnet programs are aligned with state, and local reform strategies.	*1998 MSAP applications show:* *Designs aligned with:* *State reforms - 95%* *District reforms - 28%*	2.1 1998 MSAP applications in 1999; MSAP annual project reports, 1999; MSAP evaluation, 2000.
	2.3 **State content and performance standards.** Project designs will explicitly provide evidence of the use of challenging state content and student performance standards. These are reflected in the program curriculum and in planned student assessments aligned to the curriculum.	*1998 MSAP applications show:* *Curricula link to standards?* *58% Yes* *18% In development* *25% Unable to determine from applications* *1998 MSAP applications show:* *Assessments linked to standards?* *62% Yes* *11% In development* *28% Unable to determine from applications*	2.2 Analysis of 1998 MSAP applications in 1999; MSAP annual project reports, 1999; MSAP evaluation, 2000.

Magnet Schools Assistance Program–$114,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To assist in the desegregation of schools served by local education agencies.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: The Magnet Schools Assistance Program supports objectives 1.1, 1.6, and 3.1 of the Department's Strategic Plan. The program provides financial assistance for high-quality public school choice options that are accessible to all children. The objectives are concerned with how well the program is serving the children enrolled in magnet schools, and the extent to which the program is enabling public school districts to reduce racial isolation of among and within schools. The program contributes to state and local systemic reforms, the provision of high-quality teaching and learning experiences, and the improvement of student achievement.

Objective	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
3. Federally funded magnet programs or innovative programs strengthen students' knowledge of academic subjects and skills needed for successful careers in the future.	3.1 **Improved student achievement.** Students will show achievement gains in core subjects, as well as in applied learning skills, that meet or exceed the gains for students in the district as a whole. (Applied learning skills include higher-order-thinking skills, individual problem-solving ability, communication skills, computer skills, and ability to contribute to group projects.)	*While not specific to federally supported magnets, other studies show that magnet school students performed better in reading, science, and social studies than students in comprehensive public high schools and private high schools.*	3.1 Gamoran, 1996; Analysis of 1998 MSAP applications, 1999; MSAP annual project reports, 1999; MSAP evaluation, 2000.
4. Innovative programs assist in the desegregation of schools through effective strategies other than magnet schools and through parental and community involvement.	4.1 **Assist in desegregation.** Innovative programs involving strategies (other than magnet schools) such as neighborhood schools, and community model schools organized around a special emphasis, theme, or concept will measurably assist in the desegregation of schools.		4.1 Innovative Programs (5111) applications, 1999; Innovative Programs annual project reports, beginning 2000.
	4.2 **Parental and community involvement.** Projects will incorporate practices that support extensive parental and community involvement that are related to the program model (e.g., neighborhood school, community model school) being implemented.		4.2 Innovative Programs (5111) applications, 1999; Innovative Programs annual project reports, beginning 2000.

Key Strategies

- Provide technical assistance to grantees on the integration and use of the performance indicators in applications and reports.
- Disseminate through conferences and meetings information on best practices and strategies for achieving program objectives.

Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Program--$31,700,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: **To ensure access of homeless children and youth to the same free, appropriate public education, including a public preschool education, as is provided to other children and youth.**

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: This program is designed to increase homeless children and youth's access to public education and educational support services by requiring that states remove barriers to their participation. It addresses the Department's objective 2.4 (that special populations participate in appropriate services and assessments consistent with high standards).

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Sources, Periodicity, Next Update
1. **Homeless children and youth will have greater access to a free and appropriate public education.**	1.1 **Public schools.** An increasing percentage of homeless children and youth will enroll in public schools and will attend school regularly.	*In 1996-97 states reported that approximately 78% of homeless children and youth in grades K-12 were enrolled in school.*	1.1 Triennial State Data Collection Report, 1998.
	1.2 **Program access.** An increasing number of homeless children and youth will have access to all federal programs and state-sponsored academic programs.	*In 1996-97 states reported that approximately 55% of homeless children and youth were attending school regularly during homelessness.*	1.2 Unpublished Tabulations, Follow-up to the National Evaluation, 1998.
	1.3 **Eliminating barriers.** Decreasing numbers of states will report transportation, immunization, and residency requirements as barriers to access to education.	*In 1998, 29 states reported that homeless children and youth have no difficulty accessing Title I, 14 states reported no difficulty accessing special education, and 21 states reported no difficulty accessing state compensatory education. Most other states reported a degree of difficulty with access to these three programs.*	1.3 Unpublished Tabulations, Follow-up to the National Evaluation, 1998.
	1.4 **Preschool-age children**. An increasing percentage of preschool-age homeless children will enroll in preschool programs.	*In 1998, 6 states reported that immunization requirements still pose a barrier, 13 states reported that requirements for legal guardianship still pose a barrier, and 18 states reported that transportation still poses a barrier to the enrollment of homeless children and youth.* *In 1998, states reported that 21 % of homeless preschool age children are enrolled in preschool programs.*	1.4 Triennial State Data Collection Report, 1998.

Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Program–$31,700,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To ensure access of homeless children and youth to the same free, appropriate public education, including a public preschool education, as is provided to other children and youth.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: This program is designed to increase homeless children and youth's access to public education and educational support services by requiring that states remove barriers to their participation. It addresses the Department's objective 2.4 (that special populations participate in appropriate services and assessments consistent with high standards).

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Sources, Periodicity, Next Update
2. Homeless children and youth will have greater opportunities to meet the same challenging state student performance standards held for all students.	2.1 **Success.** More states will collect data on the effectiveness of school district activities that improve homeless children and youth's capacity to meet challenging academic standards.	*Eight states collect information on the effectiveness of LEA educational programs and strategies serving homeless children and youth.*	2.1 Unpublished Tabulations, Follow-up to the National Evaluation, 1999.
3. Coordination among state agencies that provide services to homeless families will improve.	3.1 **Coordination.** An increasing number of states will report that they are engaging in activities to improve coordination among state agencies that provide services to homeless families.	*In 1998, 24 states reported that they are collaborating and coordinating with other state government agencies.*	3.1 Unpublished Tabulations, Follow-up to the National Evaluation, 1998.

Key Strategies

- Promote state awareness of the need to improve access to education for homeless children by encouraging the Title I and Homeless program coordinators to work together.
- Require state Homeless program coordinators to ensure that school districts have designated local homeless liaison personnel.
- Disseminate successful practices through national conferences, regional meetings, publications, and site visits.
- Disseminate information and guidance on the statutory requirement that preschool-age children have access to appropriate services.
- The Comprehensive Regional Assistance Centers (CCs) will provide technical assistance to states and districts in developing and implementing plans to increase the achievement of homeless children and youth.

Women's Educational Equity (WEEA)--$3,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To promote equity in education for women and girls in the United States.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: The Women's Educational Equity Program objectives support objective 1.1 of the Department's Strategic Plan. The program provides financial assistance and information that will help ensure that girls and women receive equitable opportunities to receive high-quality instruction and to learn to high standards and achieve success without encountering gender bias.

Objective	Indicator	Performance Data	Sources, Periodicity, Next Update
1. **Promote gender equity in education to ensure that girls and women have educational opportunities comparable to those available to boys and men.**	1.1 **LEA implementation**. Increasing percentages of LEAs will request information about and implement research-based curriculum, policies, and practices that ensure gender equity in education.		1.1 Performance reports, annual, 2000. WEEA Resource Center Report, 2000.
2. **Promote training activities that prepare educators to meet the needs of women and girls, including those who suffer from multiple forms of discrimination (i.e., sex, race, ethnic origin, limited English proficiency, disability, or age).**	2.1 **Training strategies**. Increasing numbers of educators served by the program will receive gender equity training, including training that deals with multiple forms of discrimination.		2.1 Performance reports, annual, 2000; WEEA Resource Center Report, 2000.

Key Strategies

- School Improvement Program (SIP) staff will coordinate with the Resource Center to disseminate current gender equity materials and resources, and to provide technical assistance on their use.
- SIP staff will coordinate with the WEEA Resource Center to disseminate information on effective training techniques and promising practices for equity in education. SIP will include training as a competitive priority in future grant applications.

118

119

Title IV of the Civil Rights Act: Equity Assistance Center Program--$7,334,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To support access and equity in public schools and help school districts to solve equity problems in education related to race, gender, and national origin.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: The Equity Assistance Centers program objectives support objectives 1.1, 1.6, and 2.4 of the Department's Strategic Plan. The centers funded by the program provide technical assistance designed to help school districts ensure that students who have been subject to racial, ethnic, or gender bias have equitable opportunities to learn to high standards.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Sources, Periodicity, Next Update
1. **Provide high-quality technical assistance and training to public school districts in addressing equity in education.**	1.1 **Addressing educational problems.** An increasing percentage of Equity Assistance Center (EAC) technical assistance services help students affected by problems in equity related to race, gender, or national origin to have better opportunities to make progress in meeting or exceeding state performance standards.		1.1 EAC annual performance report, 2000.
2. **Develop an effective collaborative working relationship with other technical assistance providers to ensure that equity needs are addressed.**	2.1 **Collaboration with other technical assistance providers.** As a result of coordination activities, appropriate referrals and joint technical assistance activities with research institutions and other technical assistance providers will increase annually.		2.1 EAC annual performance reports, 1999.

Key Strategies

- ❖ Conduct timely communication of ED information regarding strategies to ensure that all students have opportunities to meet high standards.
- ❖ Encourage districts implementing school choice and other programs to consider assistance that is available from EACs in the formulation of their strategies to improve equality of student access and involvement in high-quality instructional programs.
- ❖ Disseminate information and provide regular updates from Office for Civil Rights (OCR), Office of the General Council (OGC), and other appropriate sources on issues regarding equity in education to EACs.
- ❖ SIP staff will include in EAC cooperative agreements a requirement to collaborate with each other and ED on the development and use of a survey plan (winter, 1998/99).
- ❖ Create or expand both regional and national networks of technical assistance providers through joint meetings and other activities.
- ❖ Maintain lists of all technical assistance providers on ED web site.
- ❖ Invite other technical assistance providers to meetings of EAC directors to expand directors' knowledge of resources and mandates of the other technical assistance providers.

Allen J. Ellender Fellowship Program--$0 (FY 2000)

Goal: To improve participants' knowledge, skills, and attitudes regarding the three branches of government

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: The Ellender Fellowships program objectives support objective 1.1 of the Strategic Plan. The program provides fellowships to students from low-income families and their teachers to participate in seminars on government and current events. The program seeks to increase students' knowledge and skills in civic participation.

Objective	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
1. **Implement a program to increase students' knowledge and skills in civic participation, with emphasis on students with special needs.**	1.1 **Students from targeted groups.** Each year, an increasing percentage of participants will be students with special needs (e.g., those with disabilities, ethnic minorities, and migrant). *Targets will be set in September 1999.*		1.1 Grantees analysis, 1999.
	1.2 **Student knowledge.** Students will demonstrate an increased understanding of the democratic process. *Targets will be set in September 1999.*		1.2 Grantee analysis of student and teacher surveys, 1999.
2. **Increase the impact of the Ellender fellowships program through teacher training, educational materials, and development of civic education programs.**	2.1 **Development of civic education programs.** More teachers will use information and strategies from grantee's professional development program.		2.1 Grantee site visits, 1999.
3. **Make progress toward full financial independence from federal funding.**	3.1 **Increased private funding**. An increasing percentage of grantees' funding will come from nonfederal sources. *Targets set in 1999.*		3.1 Annual audit and grantee reports; first available 1999.

Key Strategies

- ❖ Disseminate information about the program to states and school districts in rural areas/small towns, and providers of technical assistance.
- ❖ Encourage grantees to allocate more student fellowships to schools with high proportions of students with special needs.
- ❖ Work with grantees to develop and refine plans for obtaining funding from nonfederal sources.

Native Hawaiian Education Program--$20,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To assist the Native Hawaiian population achieve to challenging standards through supporting supplemental programs that meet their unique needs.

Relation of Program to Strategic Plan: The Education for Native Hawaiians program supports objectives 1.1 and 2.4 of the Department's Strategic Plan. The program provides assistance for educational services that meet the special needs of Native Hawaiian children and families so that these children can learn to high standards.

Objective	Indicators	Performance Data	Sources, Periodicity, Next Update
1. Native Hawaiian students will enter school ready to learn and achieve to high standards.	1.1 **Children's school readiness.** Increasing percentages of Native Hawaiian children will improve on measures of school readiness and literacy.		1.1 Performance reports, annual, 1999.
	1.2 **Challenging curriculum**. Increasing numbers of Native Hawaiian students will participate in challenging, culturally-based curriculum and instructional programs.	*In 1997-98, approximately 3,000 Native Hawaiian students participated in curriculum and instructional programs supported by this program.*	1.2 Performance reports, annual, 1999.
2. Teachers will receive training and have access to instructional resources that meet the unique educational needs of Native Hawaiian students.	2.1 **Professional development**. The number of teachers of Native Hawaiian students who will be prepared to address Native Hawaiians unique needs will increase each year.	*In 1997-98 500 teachers participated in professional development activities to address the needs of Native Hawaiian students.*	2.1 Performance reports, annual, 1999.
3. Native Hawaiian students will have access to a postsecondary education.	3.1 **Undergraduate enrollment and completion.** Increasing percentages of Native Hawaiian students will attend and complete postsecondary institutions in comparison with historic trends for the Native Hawaiian population.	*In 1997-98, Native Hawaiians represented 13% of enrollment in the University of Hawaii system.*	3.1 Performance report by Kamehameha Schools Bishop Estate, annual, 1998

Key Strategies

- Program staff will share promising models, approaches, and research with Native Hawaiian projects.
- Program staff will share information on effective parent involvement models and approaches from Title I and other Department of Education programs.
- Program staff will help facilitate networking among schools, Native Hawaiian education organizations, and resource centers to address the needs of Native Hawaiian students.
- OPE will provide information on counseling, support services, and other promising activities that meet the needs of at-risk students and encourage their inclusion in postsecondary programs.

Alaska Native Education Program--$10,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To assist the Alaska Native population to achieve to challenging standards through supporting supplemental programs that meet their unique educational needs.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: The Alaska Native Education program objectives support objectives 1.1 and 2.4 of the Department's strategic plan. The program provides financial assistance for educational services that meet the special needs of Alaska Native children and families so that these children can learn to high standards.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Sources, Periodicity, Next Update
1. **Alaska Native students will have access to instruction and curriculum that meets their unique educational needs.**	1.1 **Student achievement.** Increasing percentages of Alaska Native students will meet or exceed the performance standards that are established by the state or district, or on national assessments.		1.1 Performance reports, annual, 1999.
	1.2 **Professional development.** The number of teachers of Alaska Native students that will be prepared to address Alaska Natives' unique needs will increase each year.		1.2 Performance reports, annual, 1999.
	1.3 **Support services.** Increasing percentages of Alaska Native enrichment programs will provide support services to families that enable students to benefit from the program.		1.3 Performance reports, annual, 1999.
2. **Parents of Alaska Native preschool students will become more effective educators through active involvement in their child's education.**	2.1 **Parent involvement.** The number of parents reporting improved ability to teach their children will increase each year.		2.1 Performance reports, annual, 1999.

Key Strategies

- Program staff will provide information to help facilitate networking among schools, Alaska Native education organizations, and resource centers to address the needs of Alaska Native students.
- Program staff will share promising models, approaches, and research with Alaskan Native projects.

Public Charter Schools Program (PCSP)–$130,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To support the creation of a large number of high-quality charter schools and evaluate their effects.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: The Public Charter Schools Program (PCSP) objectives support objective 1.6 of the Department's Strategic Plan (greater public school choice will be available to all students and families.) PCSP objectives seek to expand the number and variety of options available for families. These objectives also strive to improve the quality and accountability of those options, while working to increase positive impacts on the public school system. The program is concerned with increasing the numbers of charter schools, ensuring that these schools have adequate flexibility, are held accountable for reaching high standards, and are open to all students.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
1. **Encourage the development of a large number of high-quality charter schools that are free from state or local rules that inhibit flexible operation, are held accountable for enabling students to reach challenging state performance standards, and are open to all students.**	1.1 **State legislation.** By 2000, 40 states will have charter school legislation.	*As of January 1999, 34 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico have charter school legislation.*	1.1 A Study of Charter Schools Second-Year Report 1998; also see The Condition of Charter Schools, 1999; see other reports, which are untitled at this point but which will be released annually, or more frequently for minor studies, in 1999 and 2000.
	1.2 **Charter operations.** By 2002, there will be 3,000 charter schools in operation around the nation.	*Number of charter schools in operation:* *'94 – '95: 100* *'95 – '96: 255* *'96 – '97: 428* *'97 – '98: 790* *'98 – '99: 1100*	1.2 RPP study (1998, 1999, 2000), state legislatures, state education agencies.
	1.3 **Flexibility.** By 2002, 75% of states receiving PCSP funds will exempt charter schools from significant state and local rules that inhibit school improvement, and each charter school will have a high degree of autonomy over its budgets and expenditures.		1.3 Evaluation of the federal charter schools program (2000, 2001, 2002), accountability study (1999), as well as the grant competition under PCSP.
	1.5 **Accountability.** By 2002, 75% of states receiving PCSP funds will require each charter school's charter to include measurable objectives and specific timelines for meeting student performance goals, including the extent to which students meet or exceed state performance standards. States will also require chartering entities to hold charter schools accountable for meeting the terms of their charter at least once every 5 years.		1.5 RPP study (2000), evaluation of the federal charter schools program (2000, 2001, 2002), other research studies (1998, 1999), as well as the grant. competition under PCSP.

Public Charter Schools Program (PCSP)–$130,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: **To support the creation of a large number of high-quality charter schools and evaluate their effects.**

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: The Public Charter Schools Program (PCSP) objectives support objective 1.6 of the Department's Strategic Plan (greater public school choice will be available to all students and families.) PCSP objectives seek to expand the number and variety of options available for families. These objectives also strive to improve the quality and accountability of those options, while working to increase positive impacts on the public school system. The program is concerned with increasing the numbers of charter schools, ensuring that these schools have adequate flexibility, are held accountable for reaching high standards, and are open to all students.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
2. **Evaluate the effects of charter schools, including identifying the most effective strategies to improve quality and innovation in the public school system.**	2.1 **Impact of charters on educational opportunity.** Studies will show that charter schools are open and accessible to all students.	*In 1997-98, 59% of charter schools served student populations with racial demographics that roughly matched those in local school systems. Also in 1997-98, about 8% of students in charter schools were students with disabilities (as compared to 11% in all public schools in the sixteen charter states).*	2.1 RPP study (2000), evaluation of the federal charter schools program (2000, 2001, 2002), other research studies (1998, 1999).
	2.2 **Impact on student achievement.** By 2000, a national study of charter schools will have been completed to examine the characteristics of charter schools (e.g., range of flexibility, accountability measures, etc.) and the impact of charter schools on student achievement.		2.2 RPP study (2000), evaluation of the federal charter schools program (2000, 2001, 2002).
	2.3 **Impact on public school system.** By 2000, increasing numbers of charter schools will work with other charter schools and traditional public schools to develop, study and disseminate promising educational practices.		2.3 RPP case studies (2000), evaluation of the federal charter schools program (2000, 2001, 2002), possibly new study to be planned. As well as data from PCSP grant competition for dissemination grants.

Key Strategies

- Provide support and technical assistance for state and regional information and outreach meetings.
- Support a charter school Web site, including interactive forums and a national registry of charter schools to provide information on common issues.
- Provide information about model charters and chartering processes for chartering agencies through documents and meetings.
- Convene a national conference for federal charter school grantees and others, to discuss lessons learned about equity, performance accountability, effective management, leadership and partnerships, and cross-fertilization to non-chartered schools.
- Support studies of issues associated with charter schools such as serving students with disabilities, assessment and accountability, fairness/equity, and school finance.
- Collect and disseminate information on charter school models that promote student achievement and innovation in the public school system and support the development of networks among charter schools.
- Meet with universities, museums, organizations that educate disadvantaged children, and others with the capacity to help charter schools in order to encourage their support in sponsoring and providing technical assistance to charter schools and potential developers of charter schools.

Comprehensive Centers Program–$32,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: **To assist Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) recipients in improving teaching and learning for all children, particularly children at risk of educational failure.**

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Goal 1. High standards for all students are addressed in objectives 1.1, 1.2., 1.3, 1.4 and 1.7; Goal 2. A solid foundation for learning is tied to objectives 2.1, 2.2 and 2.4; Goal 4. Results, service quality, and customer satisfaction – tied to objectives 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Sources, Periodicity, Next Update
1. **Provide high-quality comprehensive technical assistance to states, territories, tribes, school districts, and schools that helps students reach high academic standards.**	1.1 **Addressing legislative priorities**. By 1999, 85% of comprehensive center (CC) customers will represent Schoolwide Programs or high-poverty districts and Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA)-funded schools.	*In 1998, according to CC progress reports, 50% of CC services were targeted to schools. Of these services to schools, 66% were delivered to high-poverty schools and 50% were delivered to Schoolwide Program schools.*	1.1 Comprehensive center (CC) performance reports, quarterly and annual, 1999; report on program evaluation, 1999.
	1.2 **Integrating technical assistance**. By 1999, 65% of CC activities will provide integrated, non-categorical technical assistance (such as standards, assessment of special populations, reading, challenging curriculum, and whole school reform).	*In 1998, according to CC progress reports, 61% of CC activities in 1998 addressed topics that were non-categorical(e.g., reading, challenging standards and accountability, curriculum and instruction, assessments, school reform).*	1.2 CC performance reports, quarterly and annual, 1999; report on program evaluation, 1999.
	1.3 **Addressing customer needs.** The percentage of clients reporting satisfaction with the usefulness of technical assistance provided will increase annually, reaching 65% by 2000.	*In 1998, 64 percent of state federal program administrators reported that Comprehensive Center assistance on planning and carrying out whole school reform was helpful or very helpful.*	1.3 Report on program evaluation, 1999.

Key Strategies

- Collaborate across CCs on Reading Success Network.
- Communicate with CCs on statutory and program priorities, and encourage CCs to develop strategies to further objectives in ED strategic plan.
- Identify and disseminate models of technical assistance that are non-categorical and support coordination of programs.
- Strengthen communication with customers (SEAs, LEAs, etc.) to ensure that the types of services delivered by CCs meet customer needs.
- Through Integrated Reviews, meetings with SEA and LEA officials, and other activities, identify capacity- building needs and interests and encourage SEAs and LEAs to use their CC to meet those needs.
- Create or expand regional and national networks of technical assistance providers through activities such as joint meetings of CCs and other service providers.

Advanced Placement Test Fees--$20,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: **To increase the numbers of low-income high school students prepared to pursue higher education.**

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: The Advanced Placement program supports objective 3.1 of the Department's Strategic Plan. The program subsidizes the advanced placement test fees for low-income students to promote education excellence and equal access to higher education for these students.

Objective	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
1. **Encourage a greater number of low-income students to participate in the Advanced Placement (AP) program.**	1.1 **Students served.** The number of low-income students taking AP tests will increase by 10% annually (e.g., to 83,300 in 1999).	*In 1998, 75,739 Advanced Placement tests were taken by low-income students.*	1.1 Performance reports, annual, 1999; Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1999; Schools and Staffing Surveys, 2001; College Board.
	1.2 **Participating districts.** The number of school districts participating in regional AP informational meetings will increase by 25% annually, with an established baseline of 4,000 in 1999.	*In 1999, 4,000 school districts participated.*	1.2 Performance reports, annual, 1999; Longitudinal Survey of Schools, 1999; Schools and Staffing Surveys, 2001.

Key Strategies

- Pursue strategies to encourage more low-income, minority, and students with special needs to complete the challenging academic courses that are prerequisite to AP courses and take AP courses.
- Disseminate information to the public about the availability of dollars to pay for or to help pay for AP test fees. Beginning in 1999, at least four regional workshops will be held annually for school districts, focusing on the identification of low-income AP students and teacher preparation.

Reading Excellence Program--$286,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To improve reading instruction by supporting research-based reading programs that demonstrate high quality reading instruction, excellent professional development, emergent literacy and transition services that help children enter school ready to learn, parent literacy and parenting education, and supportive tutoring.

Relationship of Objectives to Strategic Plan: The Reading Excellence program directly supports Objective 2.2 (every child reading by the end of 3rd grade) in its support of professional development and services for high quality, research-based reading programs and supportive tutoring services. The program also supports Objective 2.4 (special populations) because it focuses its resources on districts with high poverty rates or numbers and districts with schools identified as needing school improvement. Models resulting from this program will be helpful to similar districts elsewhere. The program supports Objective 2.1 (all children entering school ready to learn) through its family literacy activities. Finally, this program will identify effective models for teacher training in reading that can be used in support of Objective 1.4 (teacher preparation).

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Sources, Periodicity, Next Update
1. **Support improvements in students' reading achievement.**	1.1 **Student achievement.** Increasing percentages of fourth-graders will score at or above the basic level in reading on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). *(context indicator)*	*In 1994, only 60% of 4th graders scored at the basic or higher levels on NAEP.* *In 1998, 62% of 4th graders scored at those levels.* *This leaves 38% of public schools children at below even a basic reading level.*	1.1 National Assessment of Educational Progress, every four years, 1999.
2. **Significantly improve students' achievement in participating schools and classrooms.**	2.1 **Participating students' achievement.** By 2001, participating students will increase their reading scores significantly compared to comparable non-participants.	*New program.*	2.1 National Evaluation of the Reading Excellence Program (impact component), annual, 2001.

Reading Excellence Program--$286,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: **To improve reading instruction by supporting research-based reading programs that demonstrate high quality reading instruction, excellent professional development, emergent literacy and transition services that help children enter school ready to learn, parent literacy and parenting education, and supportive tutoring.**

Relationship of Objectives to Strategic Plan: The Reading Excellence program directly supports Objective 2.2 (every child reading by the end of 3rd grade) in its support of professional development and services for high quality, research-based reading programs and supportive tutoring services. The program also supports Objective 2.4 (special populations) because it focuses its resources on districts with high poverty rates or numbers and districts with schools identified as needing school improvement. Models resulting from this program will be helpful to similar districts elsewhere. The program supports Objective 2.1 (all children entering school ready to learn) through its family literacy activities. Finally, this program will identify effective models for teacher training in reading that can be used in support of Objective 1.4 (teacher preparation).

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Sources, Periodicity, Next Update
3. **Build the capacity of states and local districts to design and implement improvement strategies for reading that result in effective changes in classrooms.**	3.1 **Teacher knowledge.** An increasing number of teachers participating in program-sponsored training will develop expertise in research-based reading instruction methods.	*New program.*	3.1 National Evaluation of the Reading Excellence Program (implementation component), every six months, 2000.
	3.2 **Instructional change.** An increasing number of teachers participating in program-sponsored training will significantly align their instruction with research-based, effective practices.		3.2 National Evaluation of the Reading Excellence Program (implementation component), every six months, 2000.
	3.3 **Tutors.** An increasing number of well-trained tutors will use research-based practices and help children learn to read.		3.3 Reading Excellence Program state evaluation system, annual, 2000; program reports from Corporation from National Service, 2000; Federal Work Study program data on tutoring, 2000.
	3.4 **Family reading.** An increasing number of parents participating in program-sponsored activities will provide home reading opportunities to their children.		3.4 Reading Excellence Program state evaluation system, annual, 2000; National Even Start Evaluation, 2000.
	3.5 **State system changes.** By January 2001, at least 15 states will have revised their state in-service training and guidelines for reading certification to reflect scientifically based reading research.		3.5 Reading Excellence Program state evaluation system, annual, 2000.
4. **Provide excellent dissemination and technical assistance services to states.**	4.1 **Customer satisfaction.** At least 90% of participating states will be highly satisfied with technical assistance and dissemination services provided by the Department of Education.	*New program.*	4.1 National Evaluation of the Reading Excellence Program (implementation component), every six months, 2000; evaluations of relevant ED technical assistance programs (such as the National Regional Laboratories), 2000.

Reading Excellence Program–$286,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To improve reading instruction by supporting research-based reading programs that demonstrate high quality reading instruction, excellent professional development, emergent literacy and transition services that help children enter school ready to learn, parent literacy and parenting education, and supportive tutoring.

Relationship of Objectives to Strategic Plan: The Reading Excellence program directly supports Objective 2.2 (every child reading by the end of 3rd grade) in its support of professional development and services for high quality, research-based reading programs and supportive tutoring services. The program also supports Objective 2.4 (special populations) because it focuses its resources on districts with high poverty rates or numbers and districts with schools identified as needing school improvement. Models resulting from this program will be helpful to similar districts elsewhere. The program supports Objective 2.1 (all children entering school ready to learn) through its family literacy activities. Finally, this program will identify effective models for teacher training in reading that can be used in support of Objective 1.4 (teacher preparation).

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Sources, Periodicity, Next Update
5. **Identify and validate research-based models of effective practice for reading instruction, reading tutoring, and professional development.**	5.1 **Model identification.** By 2001, at least 5 new, research-based reading programs or teacher training programs will be validated as effective and suitable as models for other districts and states.	*New program.*	5.1 National Evaluation of the Reading Excellence Program (model-identification component), annual, 2000; National Even Start Evaluation, 2000.

Key Strategies

- ❖ Expeditiously award funding to states with high promise for effectively implementing this new program for improving children's reading.
- ❖ Coordinate with the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD), the National Institute for Literacy (NIFL), the Department of Health and Human Services' Head Start program, the Corporation for National Service, and other ED programs with related services (for example, Title I, Even Start, IDEA, Bilingual Education, Eisenhower Professional Development, the new Teacher Quality Enhancement program, Technology Challenge programs, the new Class-size Reduction program, Federal College Work Study, Research Institutes and Regional Labs, and Adult Education). Coordination is needed to make efficient use of available federal resources and to ensure that as states and local communities are implementing the Reading Excellence Act, they receive appropriate cooperation and support from related programs.
- ❖ Establish and update guidance on effective practices in reading and professional development, based on valid and reliable scientific research. Disseminate the guidance widely to participating states and other interested states and organizations.
- ❖ Use the evaluation and dissemination funding to develop additional information on effective reading instruction and professional development (using scientifically-based evaluation research methods), in collaboration with NICHD and other offices in the Department of Education, including the Planning and Evaluation Service, Office of Educational Research and Improvement (especially the research institutes and Office of Reform Assistance and Dissemination (ORAD)), and Office of Special Education Programs.
- ❖ Develop guidance for states and local programs on appropriate evaluation and student assessment methods for inside and outside the classroom.
- ❖ Collaborate with the National Institute for Literacy as it identifies and disseminates information on scientifically-based research on reading and on effective programs, including those identified by the state or federal evaluations.

Indian Education—$77,000,0000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To assist American Indian and Alaska Native children achieve to the same challenging standards expected of all students by supporting access to programs that meet their special educational and culturally related academic needs.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: The Indian Education program supports objectives 1.1 and 2.4 of the Department's strategic plan. The program provides assistance for educational services that meet the special needs of Indian students and families so that these children can learn to high standards.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Sources, Periodicity, Next Update
1. **American Indian and Alaska Native students served by school districts receiving Indian Education grants will progress at rates similar to those for all students in achievement to standards, promotion, and graduation.**	1.1 **Student achievement.** Increasing percentages of Indian students will meet or exceed the performance standards that are established by the state, district, or tribe (as appropriate), or on national assessments. 2000 target: 60% of American Indians in grade 4 and 70% of American Indians in grade 8 will be at or above the basic level in reading proficiency. 2000 goal: 64% of American Indian students in grade 4 and 62% of American Indians in grade 8 will score at or above the basic level in reading and mathematics	***Reading:*** ❖ *In 1992, 53% of Indian students in grade 4 were at or above the basic level.* ❖ *In 1992, 61% of Indian students in grade 8 were at or above the basic level.* ❖ *In 1998, 47 % of Indian students in grade 4 were at or above the basic level.* ❖ *In 1998, 61 % of Indian students in grade 8 were at or above the basic level.* ***Math:*** ❖ *In 1992, 43% of Indian students in grade 4 scored at or above the basic level.* ❖ *In 1992, 39% of Indian students in grade 8 scored at or above the basic level.* ❖ *In 1996, 52% of Indian students in grade 4 scored at or above the basic level* ❖ *In 1996, 51%t of Indian students in grade 8 scored at or above the basic level.*	1.1 NAEP,1992, 1996, 1998; OIE Annual Project Performance Report, 1999, Title I Performance Report, 1998; and Consolidated State Performance Report, 1999 (to the extent that data are disaggregated by American Indian and Alaska Native).
	1.2 **Student promotion and graduation.** Increasing percentages of Indian students will progress from one grade level to the next and graduate at rates comparable to all students. 2000 goal: An increased percentage of American Indian and Alaska Natives 20-24 years of age will be high school graduates. 2010 goal: 80% of American Indians and Alaska Natives 20-24 years old will be high school graduates.	*In 1990, 70% of American Indians and Alaska Natives 20-24 years old were high school graduates.*	1.2 *U.S. Census 1990, Census 2000, Census 2010, OIE Annual Project Performance Report, 1999*

Indian Education—$77,000,0000 (FY 2000)

Goal: **To assist American Indian and Alaska Native children achieve to the same challenging standards expected of all students by supporting access to programs that meet their special educational and culturally related academic needs.**

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: The Indian Education program supports objectives 1.1 and 2.4 of the Department's strategic plan. The program provides assistance for educational services that meet the special needs of Indian students and families so that these children can learn to high standards.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Sources, Periodicity, Next Update
2. Help school districts help their students to reach high standards through the coordination and integration of Indian Education programs with all local, state, and federally funded programs.	**2.1 Teaching and learning strategies.** Increasing percentages of school districts that serve Indian students will coordinate culturally related services with core academic subjects (mathematics, reading, science, and social studies).		*2.1 Indian Education Program applications, 1999.*
3. Discretionary programs will focus on improving educational opportunities and services for Indian students.	3.1 Increasing percentages of the teacher and principal workforces serving Native American and Alaska Native students will themselves be American Indian and Alaska Native.	*1994 baseline: In public schools with 25% or more American Indian and Alaska Native students, 13% of principals and 15% of teachers were American Indian or Alaska Native.* *2005 goal: 18% of principals and 20% of teachers in public schools with high proportions of American Indians will be American Indian or Alaska Native.*	3.1 Schools and Staffing Survey, 2000 and 2005.

Key Strategies

- Coordinate with other ESEA programs (e.g., Title I) to help Indian children progress at rates similar to those for all students in achievement to standards, promotion, graduation, and attendance (e.g., provide joint guidance to grantees and encourage joint planning by local staff from both the Indian Education and Title I programs on how to identify and address the needs of Indian children).
- Work with school districts to ensure that Indian Education applications include targets for accomplishments of local and state standards by Indian children.
- Encourage parents and guardians of Indian students to become active partners in the educational activities at school and at home by establishing home-school communications, activities, and support systems aimed at needs of American Indian parents and students.
- Provide field-based technical assistance to grantees through workshops, institutes, and on-site reviews.
- Promote the recruitment and placement of American Indians and Alaska Natives in education positions by building partnerships between institutions of higher education and school districts serving large proportions of American Indian and Alaska Native students.
- Provide technical assistance to grantees to promote incorporation of Indian education issues into the general educational training curriculum.
- Provide technical assistance to grantees in identifying best practices on school readiness and achievement that include cognitive stimulation, parenting skills, and language acquisition.
- Disseminate Indian Education research and data collection products to grantees and other education policymakers.
- Promote and fund the over-sampling of American Indian and Alaska Native respondents in education surveys.

Bilingual Education and Minority Foreign Languages

146

147

Bilingual Education Instructional Services Program--$259,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: Help limited-English proficient (LEP) students reach high academic standards.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Bilingual Education Instructional Services programs support objective 2.4 (special populations receive appropriate services and assessments consistent with high standards by providing grants to improve the quality and availability of teaching and learning for LEP students.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Sources, Periodicity, Next Update
Student outcomes — participants in Title VII programs			
1. Improve English proficiency and academic achievement of students served by Title VII of the Bilingual Education Act.	1.1 **English proficiency.** Students in the program will annually demonstrate continuous and educationally significant progress on oral or written English proficiency measures.	*According to a sample of 1998 biennial evaluation reports,91% of projects showed that at least three-quarters of students made gains in oral English proficiency and 82% of projects showed that at least three-quarters of students made gains in written English proficiency.*	1.1 Contracted evaluation based on local project data, 1999, biennial.
	1.2 **Other academic achievement.** Students in the program will annually demonstrate continuous and educationally significant progress on appropriate academic achievement measures of language arts, reading, and math.	*According to a sample of 1998 biennial evaluation reports,61% of projects showed that at least three-quarters of students made gains in academic achievement in language arts, reading and math.*	1.2 Contracted evaluation based on local project data, 1999, biennial.
	1.3 **Success in regular classrooms.** For students who have been in the program for at least 3 years, the district will report data on achievement of LEP students compared with that of non-LEP students and the two groups will be performing comparably.		1.3 Contracted evaluation based on local project data, biennial, 1999. Separate analysis to be completed by June 2000.
Program improvement			
2. Build capacity of schools and school districts in program to serve LEP students.	2.1 **Programs meeting standards.** Each year the number of grantees meeting "criteria for model programs" will increase by 20%.		2.1 Annual Performance Report, June 1999.
	2.2 **Teacher training.** Each year, the numbers of teachers in Title VII Systemwide and Comprehensive School Grants receiving quality professional development in the instruction of LEP students will increase by 20%.		2.2 Biennial Evaluation, 1999; Annual Performance Report, 1999. OBEMLA study, June 1999.
	2.3 **Assessments linked to standards.** The number of projects that report appropriate assessments aligned to state or local standards tailored to LEP students will increase.		2.3 Biennial evaluation, 1999; Annual Performance Report, 1999; Program office monitoring.

Bilingual Education Instructional Services Program--$259,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: Help limited-English proficient (LEP) students reach high academic standards.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Bilingual Education Instructional Services programs support objective 2.4 (special populations receive appropriate services and assessments consistent with high standards by providing grants to improve the quality and availability of teaching and learning for LEP students.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Sources, Periodicity, Next Update
Research, information dissemination, and technical assistance			
3. **Provide effective guidance and technical assistance and identify and disseminate reliable information on effective practices.**	3.1 **Federal technical assistance:** An increasing percentage of local project directors will express satisfaction with technical assistance and guidance.		3.1 Annual Improving America's Schools Conference questionnaires and evaluations, 1999; regional evaluation conference evaluations, 1999; evaluations of NABE Professional Development Institute, 2000.
	3.2 **Inquiries to NCBE.** The number of inquiries to the National Clearinghouse on Bilingual Education will increase 15% per year.	*During the 1997-98 school year, NCBE received 3,100,000 inquiries.*	3.2 OBEMLA web site, 1999; NCBE annual performance report, 1999.
	3.3 **More specific reporting.** All states will report more specifically on LEP programs designed to meet the educational needs of LEP students, their academic test performance, and grade retention rates.		3.4 Redesigned Summary Report of the Survey of the States' limited-English proficient Students and Available Educational Programs and Services, annual, 1999.
Professional development			
4. **Improve the quality and quantity of educational personnel serving LEP students.**	4.1 **New teachers.** At least 3,000 teachers per year will complete high-quality bilingual education/English as a Second Language certification or degree programs through the Bilingual Education Professional Development programs.	*With the support of FY 1997 funds, 770 teachers completed certification or degree programs.*	4.1 Annual OBEMLA evaluation of projects, 1999; OBEMLA 1999 Evaluation Study.

Bilingual Education Instructional Services Program--$259,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: Help limited-English proficient (LEP) students reach high academic standards.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Bilingual Education Instructional Services programs support objective 2.4 (special populations receive appropriate services and assessments consistent with high standards by providing grants to improve the quality and availability of teaching and learning for LEP students.

Key Strategies

- Provide training in using the Guide to Evaluation for Title VII Projects to project directors and their staff through the Regional Comprehensive Centers, IASA meetings, and the OBEMLA Institute at the annual National Association of Bilingual Education conference.
- Conduct a conference for evaluators and directors of Title VII projects and include training on applying the Guide to Evaluation for Title VII Projects to their performance reports and biennial evaluations.
- Establish electronic links between the web sites of with major professional organizations and the OBEMLA web site.
- Strengthen instruments for monitoring grants to ensure that programs focus on outcomes and accountability.
- Provide technical assistance targeted to emphasize program features that will allow grantees to demonstrate that the support for LEP students will not diminish after the grant expires.
- Disseminate information on literacy and assessment of LEP students through the Comprehensive Regional Assistance Centers and the National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.
- Monitor and report on continuing analyses of "expected gains study" of LEP students.
- Commission a study on aggregation of project evaluation data.
- Expand technical assistance to grantees to promote --
  - Incorporation of LEP educational issues into the general teacher training curriculum; and
  - Partnerships between teacher training institutions and school districts.

152

153

Foreign Language Assistance Program--$6,000,000 (FY 2000)			
Goal: Help students reach national education objective of mastering one or more foreign languages.			
Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: The Foreign Language Assistance Program supports objective 1.1 (challenging standards and assessments in core academic subject areas) by providing discretionary grants to districts and states to improve foreign language instruction.			
Objective	**Indicators**	**Performance Data**	**Sources, Periodicity, Next Update**
1. Improve foreign language proficiency of students served by the Foreign Language Assistance Program (FLAP).	1.1 **Increased student achievement.** The percentage of students participating in Foreign Language Assistance Program-supported instruction who meet or exceed high standards for foreign language education will increase annually.		1.1 Review of grantee annual reports, 1999.
2. Build capacity of schools in FLAP to teach foreign languages.	2.1 **Increased school capacity for effective instruction.** At least 90% of grantees will maintain program activities for at least 3 school years after expiration of FLAP funding for the program.		2.1 Monitoring by program office staff, 1999.

Key Strategies

- ❖ Coordinate with federal, state, and local programs, professional associations, and other entities to promote effective foreign language instruction to high standards.
- ❖ Support dissemination of information on effective foreign language education and related career opportunities.
- ❖ Encourage development of effective pre-service and in-service professional development for teachers of foreign languages.
- ❖ Emphasize program features that will allow grantees to carry on activities after their grants expire.

154

155

Emergency Immigrant Education Program--$150,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: **Help offset cost of supplementary services to recent immigrant students.**

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: The Emergency Immigrant Education Program supports objective 2.4 (special populations receive appropriate services and assessments consistent with high standards by providing formula grants to states to help districts that experience large increases in their student population because of immigration.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
1. **Provide financial assistance to schools that serve large numbers of recently arrived immigrant students.**	1.1 **Use of funds.** 90% of program funds will be used for direct services to students by FY 2000.	*1995-96 baseline: 88.6%.*	1.1 SEA Biennial Report, 2001.

Key Strategies

- Provide examples of exemplary programs.
- Work with the states to ensure high-quality and complete data in Biennial Reports.

Special Education (IDEA)

158

159

IDEA Part B – Grants to States--$4,716,435,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To improve results for children with disabilities by assisting state and local education agencies to provide children with disabilities access to high-quality education that will help them meet challenging standards and prepare them for employment and independent living.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Goal 1, Help all students reach challenging academic standards (All objectives); Goal 2, Solid foundation for learning for all children (all objectives); Goal 3, Ensure access to postsecondary education (objective 3.1); Goal 4, Focus on results, quality of service and customer satisfaction (objective 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4).

Objective	Indicator	Performance Data	Sources, Periodicity, Next Update
1. Improve educational results of children with disabilities.	1.1 **Graduation and school completion.** The percentage of children with disabilities exiting school who graduate with a diploma will increase, and the percentage of children with disabilities who drop out will decrease. Target: By 2000, the percentage of students ages 14 - 21 who graduate with a regular diploma will increase to 57%, and the percentage who drop out will decrease to 30 percent.	*In 1997, among students with disabilities ages 14 -21 who are known to have left school, 53% graduated with a regular diploma and 34% dropped out.*	1.1 State- reported data, annual, 2000.
	1.2 **Performance on assessments**. The gap between the average score of children with disabilities and children without disabilities in reading, math, science, and other academic areas will decrease. Target: By 2000, the gap between the average score of children with disabilities and children without disabilities will decrease by 10% in math and science.	*In 1996, the NAEP average scores of students:* *With disabilities* / *Without* Math: *4th grade: 205 224* *8th grade: 234 275* *12th grade: 257 304* *Science:* *4th grade: 129 152* *8th grade: 149 152* *12th grade: 112 151*	1.2 Analysis of 1996 data from National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2001.
2. Improve participation in postsecondary education and employment.	2.1 **Postsecondary education**. The percentage of students going on to postsecondary education (e.g., four year colleges, two year community colleges and technical schools) will increase. Target: By 2004, 20 percent of youth with disabilities who left high school in the prior two years will be enrolled in some type of postsecondary school.	*Of youth with disabilities who left high school in the 1985-86 or 1986-87, 14% had enrolled in some type of postsecondary school by the fall of 1987.*	2.1 Secondary Longitudinal Study, 2006. Related Source Data: National Clearinghouse on Post Secondary Education for Individuals with Disabilities, 1999.

IDEA Part B – Grants to States--$4,716,435,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To improve results for children with disabilities by assisting state and local education agencies to provide children with disabilities access to high-quality education that will help them meet challenging standards and prepare them for employment and independent living.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Goal 1, Help all students reach challenging academic standards (All objectives); Goal 2, Solid foundation for learning for all children (all objectives); Goal 3, Ensure access to postsecondary education (objective 3.1); Goal 4, Focus on results, quality of service and customer satisfaction (objective 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4).

Objective	Indicator	Performance Data	Sources, Periodicity, Next Update
	2.2 **Employment and postsecondary education**. The percentage of students with disabilities who are either employed or participating in postecondary education 2 years after leaving high school will increase. Target: By 2004, 69 percent of youth with disabilities who left high school in the prior two years will be either employed or participating in postecondary education.	*Of youth with disabilities who left high school in the 1985-86 or 1986-87 school year, 59% were either employed or participating in postsecondary education in the fall of 1987.*	2.2 Secondary Longitudinal Study, 2003.
	2.3 **Improved earnings.** The median hourly wage of individuals with disabilities obtaining employment within 2 years of leaving high school will increase. Target: By 2004, the median hourly wage of individuals with disabilities obtaining employment within 2 years of leaving high school will increase by $2.00 after adjusting for inflation.	*In the 1986-87 school-year, the median hourly wage of individuals with disabilities who were employed was $4.00.*	2.3 Secondary Longitudinal Study, 2006.
3. **All children with disabilities will participate in regular education settings with non-disabled age-appropriate peers to the maximum extent appropriate.**	3.1 **Participation in regular education settings** The percentage of children ages 3 - 21 with disabilities who participate for most of the day with the regular education classroom, with appropriate supports and accommodations (e.g. behavioral interventions and adaptive instructional materials) will increase. Preschool children with disabilities will receive services in settings with typically developing peers. Target: By 2000-01, 50% of children with disabilities ages 6 - 21 will be reported by states as being served in the regular education classroom 80% of the day or more.	*46% of elementary school children with disabilities ages 6 –21 were reported by states as being served in regular education classrooms at least 80% of the time for the 1996-97 school year.*	3.1 State-reported data, annual, 2003.

IDEA Part B – Grants to States--$4,716,435,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: **To improve results for children with disabilities by assisting state and local education agencies to provide children with disabilities access to high-quality education that will help them meet challenging standards and prepare them for employment and independent living.**

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Goal 1, Help all students reach challenging academic standards (All objectives); Goal 2, Solid foundation for learning for all children (all objectives); Goal 3, Ensure access to postsecondary education (objective 3.1); Goal 4, Focus on results, quality of service and customer satisfaction (objective 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4).

Objective	Indicator	Performance Data	Sources, Periodicity, Next Update
4. Children with disabilities will be identified and served earlier	4.1 **Early identification and intervention.** The percent of children served under IDEA ages 6 or 7 will increase compared to the total number of children served ages 6-21.	*In school–year 1997-98, 13% of the total number of children ages 6-21 counted under IDEA were ages 6 or 7.*	4.1 State-reported data, annual, 2005.
5. All children with disabilities will receive appropriate services that address their individual needs, including related services and assistive technology.	5.1 **Transition services**. All students with disabilities ages 14 and older will have IEPs that include a statement of transition service needs that will help focus on the student's courses of study (e.g. advanced placement courses or a vocational education program.		5.1 Secondary Longitudinal Study, 2002 and 2007. Related source of data: monitoring reports, 1999.
	5.2 **Parent satisfaction**. The percentage of parents who are satisfied that their children ages 3-5 and 6-21 receive the appropriate services to address their individual needs will increase over time.		6.4 Preschool Longitudinal Study (PLS) (future), 2002 and 2007. Special Education Elementary Longitudinal Study (SEELS), 2001 and 2006. Secondary Longitudinal Study, 2002 and 2007.
6. Schools will provide appropriate behavioral interventions for children with disabilities whose behavior impedes the learning of themselves or others.	6.1 **Disciplinary actions**. The percentage of children with disabilities who have been suspended or expelled will decrease.	*During the 1993-94 school year, 6.2% of children with disabilities in elementary and secondary schools were suspended.*	6.1 State reported data, 1999 and 2006.
7. States ensure children with disabilities are a part of all accountability systems and actively work to monitor and improve their performance.	7.1 **Participation in assessments.** States include children with disabilities, as appropriate, in general state and/or local assessment and report results starting July 1998. States will include children with disabilities not in general assessments but who participate in alternate assessments and report results by July 2000. Target: By 2000, all States will comply with the assessment requirements reflected in this indicator.	*In 1998, participation rates were available on 10 states:* *3states had less than 80%;* *4states had between 80%-90%;* *3 states had more than 90%.* *Two states had functioning alternate assessments.*	7.1 State performance data, 2000.

IDEA Part B – Grants to States--$4,716,435,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To improve results for children with disabilities by assisting state and local education agencies to provide children with disabilities access to high-quality education that will help them meet challenging standards and prepare them for employment and independent living.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Goal 1, Help all students reach challenging academic standards (All objectives); Goal 2, Solid foundation for learning for all children (all objectives); Goal 3, Ensure access to postsecondary education (objective 3.1); Goal 4, Focus on results, quality of service and customer satisfaction (objective 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4).

Objective	Indicator	Performance Data	Sources, Periodicity, Next Update
8. **States are addressing their needs for professional development.**	8.1 **Supply of qualified personnel.** States and outlying areas will increasingly meet their identified needs for qualified personnel. Target: By 2000, the number of states and outlying areas where at least 90% of personnel are fully certified will be: 41 for special education teachers serving children 3-5, 44 for special education teachers serving children 6-21, and 52 for related services personnel.	*In school year 1995-96, the numbers of States and Outlying Areas where 90% of personnel are fully certified were: 38 for special education teachers serving children 3-5, 42 for special education teachers serving children 6-21, and 51 for related service personnel serving children 3-21.*	8.1 State-reported data, annual, 2002.
9. **States identify and correct non-compliance with IDEA**	9.1 **Correct deficiencies.** The length of time that States use to correct, subsequent to identification, persistent deficiencies through sanctions, other means of enforcement, and/or the provision of technical assistance, will decrease.		9.1 LEA data: Monitoring one-quarter of states annually and review and verification of the corrective action plan. First full cycle available 2002

Key Strategies

- ❖ Provide technical assistance, disseminate information, and train personnel on practices to improve educational results, particularly in home-school collaboration.
- ❖ Monitor states to ensure that children with disabilities are not being inappropriately suspended or expelled.
- ❖ Conduct research, provide technical assistance, and disseminate information on addressing behavior in children with disabilities, including children with emotional disturbance and behavior problems.
- ❖ Support professional development on addressing behavior for children with disabilities.
- ❖ Monitor to ensure that states develop goals and strategies and include children with disabilities in assessments.
- ❖ Support state reform efforts through State Improvement Grants.
- ❖ Conduct research, provide technical assistance, and disseminate information on appropriate accommodations for assessments, alternative assessments, performance goals, and interpretation of assessment results.
- ❖ Inform parents of assessment requirements through parent training and information dissemination.
- ❖ Monitor State Improvement Grants and State Comprehensive Systems of Personnel Development (CSPDs) to ensure that states are addressing personnel needs.
- ❖ Provide technical assistance to states to help them address their personnel needs.
- ❖ Support personnel development activities, including preparing personnel and developing model teacher preparation programs.
- ❖ Monitor states and take appropriate corrective action to ensure that states carry out their monitoring responsibilities.
- ❖ Monitor to ensure that states address technical assistance needs of school districts in their State Improvement Grants plans.

IDEA Part C – Special Education - Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities–$390,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: Family and child outcomes are enhanced by early intervention services, and states provide a comprehensive system of early intervention services for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Goal 1: All students reach challenging academic standards: objectives 1.4 and 1.5; Goal 2: Build a solid foundation for learning: objectives 2.1 and 2.4; Goal 3: Focus on results, service quality and customer satisfaction: 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
1. All eligible children are identified.	1.1 **Total number of children served.** The number of eligible infants and toddlers with disabilities being served will increase. Target: For 2000 the number of infants and toddlers served will be 208,000.	*In 1998, 197,376 infants and toddlers were served.*	1.1 State data (12/1/98) reports, annual, 1999.
	1.2 **Early identification.** By 2000, the percentage of infants served under 1 year of age, as a proportion of all children birth to 1 will increase to 0.93% in order to reach 1% by 2002.	*In 1997, the percentage of infants served under 1 year of age as a proportion of all children birth to 1 was 0.86%.*	1.2 State data (12/1/98) reports, annual, 1999.
2. Needs of the child and family are addressed in a timely, comprehensive manner in natural environments.	2.1 **Receipt of all services indicated**. The percentage of families receiving all the services identified on the individualized family service plan and the percentage of families reporting that their services were in natural environments and coordinated will increase. Target to be established 2000 when (1997-1998) data becomes available.		2.1 Office of Special Education Program's (OSEP) Early Intervention Longitudinal Study, 2000 and 2003.
	2.2 **Service settings**. The percentage of children primarily receiving age-appropriate services in home, community-based settings, and programs designed for typically-developing peers will increase to 60% in 2000.	*In 1995, the percentage of children primarily receiving services in natural settings (i.e., home, childcare, and other community-based settings) appropriate for the age of the child was 56%..*	2.2 State reported data, annual, 1999.
	2.3 **Setting of subsequent services**. The number of children making the transition into inclusive settings will increase. Target to be established 2000 when 1998-1999 baseline data becomes available.		2.3 State reported data (proposed new data element), annual, 2000 and 2003.

IDEA Part C – Special Education - Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities–$390,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: Family and child outcomes are enhanced by early intervention services, and states provide a comprehensive system of early intervention services for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Goal 1: All students reach challenging academic standards: objectives 1.4 and 1.5; Goal 2: Build a solid foundation for learning: objectives 2.1 and 2.4; Goal 3: Focus on results, service quality and customer satisfaction: 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
3. Child's functional development is enhanced by early intervention services.	3.1 **Functional abilities**. The functional abilities of children participating in the IDEA Part C program are increased and sustained. Target to be established 2005 when baseline 2003-2004 data becomes available. Target measured 2008 based upon 2006-2007 data.		3.1 OSEP's National Early Intervention Longitudinal Study, 2005 and 2008.
	3.2 **Family capacity.** The percentage of families reporting that early intervention services have increased the family's capacity to enhance their child's development will increase.		3.2 National early intervention longitudinal study, 2000 and 2003. Baseline 1998-99data to be available 2000.
4. All children receive comprehensive, effective family focused early intervention services.	4.1 **Funding sources.** The number of states accessing all appropriate sources of funding (i.e. Medicaid, Maternal and Child Health Block Grant, state general revenues) will increase. Target to be established 2002 when baseline 2001-2002 data becomes available. Target measured 2007 when 2006-2007 data becomes available.		4.1 Study of State and Local Implementation of IDEA Part C, 2002.
	4.2 **Parental satisfaction.** Increase in the number of parents who feel that the state identifies and corrects noncompliance with Part C of IDEA. Target to be established 2000 when baseline 1998-1999 data becomes available. Target measured 2003 when 2001-2002 data becomes available.		4.2 OSEP's National Early Intervention Longitudinal Study, 2000 and 2003.

IDEA Part C – Special Education - Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities--$390,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: Family and child outcomes are enhanced by early intervention services, and states provide a comprehensive system of early intervention services for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

Relation of Program to Strategic Plan: Goal 1: All students reach challenging academic standards: objectives 1.4 and 1.5; Goal 2: Build a solid foundation for learning: objectives 2.1 and 2.4; Goal 3: Focus on results, service quality and customer satisfaction: 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3.

Key Strategies

- Conduct demonstration and outreach projects on effective practices for identifying children and families who qualify for services.
- Provide targeted technical assistance and disseminate information on effective "child find" practices, focusing on states that identify and serve low percentages of children and families.
- Convene a panel of experts to evaluate and recommend ways of bringing greater uniformity to the definition of developmental delay.
- Monitor state practices and state applications to ensure that the child and family receive timely and appropriate, individualized services based on the needs identified in a comprehensive, multidisciplinary assessment.
- Conduct research to identify effective practices for providing and coordinating services in ways that are cost-effective and comprehensive, and support the family's needs.
- Conduct research, provide technical assistance, and disseminate information on effective home visiting and other practices that increase families' capacity to care for their children.
- Support and encourage Parent Training and Information Centers (PTIs) and Community Resource Centers in serving families of eligible children from birth to age 3.
- Encourage an emphasis on transition in the state self-assessment process as part of monitoring activities.
- Provide technical assistance and disseminate information on effective transition practices, with particular focus on transitioning children to natural community-based settings.
- Work with the Federal Interagency Coordinating Council to improve transitions into and out of programs that serve children with disabilities and their families.
- Ensure that all OSEP Clearinghouses, where appropriate, provide timely, understandable and useful information to families of eligible children from birth to age 3.
- Conduct research to determine short- and long-range child outcomes and to determine how developmentally appropriate practices can be conducted within family friendly models (e.g., Institute on Early Childhood Program Performance Measures).

IDEA Part D--National Activities--$343,461,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: **To link best practices to states, school systems, and families to improve results for infants, toddlers, and children with disabilities.**

Relation of Program to Strategic Plan: Goal 1: All students reach challenging academic standards ; objectives 1.4, 1.5 and 1.7. Goal 2: Build a solid foundation for learning; objective 2.4. Goal 4: Focus on results, service quality and customer satisfaction; objectives 4.1, 4..3, and 4.4.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
1. **Research and innovation programs respond to critical needs and advance knowledge to improve results for children with disabilities.** ***(research and innovation)***	1.1 **Rigorous research.** The percentage of projects that use rigorous quantitative or qualitative research and evaluation methods will increase. *Target* to be established in FY1999.		1.1 Task order to evaluate results of standing panels' review of grant applications, annual, 1999.
	1.2 **Communicate findings.** Increase in the percentage of findings, including appropriate citation, communicated by researchers through refereed journals and other mechanisms such as the WWW, association publications, and IDEA or other Education-department supported TA providers.	*From 1984-94, the ratio of products communicated to the number of research projects was 5:1.*	1.2 Task order to review final grant reports, annual, 1999.
2. **Educational technology and media services will respond to critical needs and advance knowledge to improve results for children and adults with disabilities.** ***(technology and media services)***	2.1 **Consumer impact.** The percentage of parents, teachers, practitioners, people with disabilities, and technical assistance providers who regard IDEA-supported technology and media research as improving educational policies and practices in special education and early intervention will increase. *Target* to be established in FY1999.		2.1 Task order, retrospective review, 1999. *Target data: National Longitudinal Studies, 2004.*
	2.2 **Communicate Findings.** The ratio of the number of information products communicated by technology projects to the number of OSEP-funded projects will increase. Target: By 2000, the ratio of products to the number of research projects will be 3:1.	*From 1984-94, the ratio of products communicated to the number of research projects as 2:1.*	2.2 Task order to review final grant reports, annual, 1999.
3. **Assist States in addressing identified needs for highly qualified personnel to serve children with disabilities.** ***(personnel preparation)***	3.1 **Reduce shortages.** Decrease in the shortage of leadership personnel and personnel serving children with low-incidence disabilities. *Target* to be established in FY 1999	*Preliminary 1996-97 state-reported data indicates that 6.4% of teachers serving children with low-incidence disabilities are not fully certified, and 1.4% of teaching positions are vacant.*	3.1 Task order on personnel preparation, 1999.
	3.2 **Capacity of minority institutions.** The percentage of historically black colleges and universities and other minority institutions, including tribal colleges, that have received technical assistance to improve their capacity to train highly qualified personnel will increase.		3.2 Task order on personnel preparation, 1999.

IDEA Part D--National Activities--$343,461,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To link best practices to states, school systems, and families to improve results for infants, toddlers, and children with disabilities.

Relation of Program to Strategic Plan: Goal 1: All students reach challenging academic standards ; objectives 1.4, 1.5 and 1.7. Goal 2: Build a solid foundation for learning; objective 2.4. Goal 4: Focus on results, service quality and customer satisfaction; objectives 4.1, 4..3, and 4.4.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
4. Technical Assistance (TA) and information will be coordinated and accessible to parents, teachers, and practitioners, people with disabilities, and will result in improved practices ***(technical assistance and information)***	**4.1 Consumer impact**. The percentage of parents, teachers and practitioners who regard IDEA-supported TA and information as meeting critical needs and improving educational policies and practices in special education and early intervention will increase. T*arget* to be established in FY2001.		4.1 Task order, retrospective review, 1999. *Target data: National Longitudinal Study,2004.*
5. State improvement grants will increase and improve the adoption of effective practices by school districts. ***(state improvement)***	**5.1 Supply of qualified personnel.** States and outlying areas will increasing meet their identified needs for qualified personnel. *Target:* By 2000, the number of states and outlying areas where at least 90% of personnel are fully certified will be: 41 for special education teachers serving children 3-5, 44 for special education teachers serving children 6-21, and 52 for related services personnel.	*In school year 1995-96, the numbers of States and Outlying Areas where 90% of personnel are fully certified were: 38 for special education teachers serving children 3-5, 42 for special education teachers serving children 6-21, and 51 for related services personnel serving children 3-21.*	5.1 State-reported data, annual, 2002.
6. Families receive the information and training that they need to increase their participation in their child's education and services. ***(parent training and information)***	**6.1 Families served.** The percentage of families of children with disabilities receiving services from parent programs will increase. T*arget* to be established in FY1999.		6.1 Parent, teacher, consumer survey, 1999. *Target data: National Longitudinal Studies, 2004.*
	6.2 Informed families. Increase in the percentage of families who report satisfaction with the information and training they receive about rights, protections, effective practices, education reform issues such as assessment and related issues Target: In 2000, 75% of families served by Parent Training and Information Centers (PTIs) will report that the information and assistance received from the PTIs made a positive difference in their child's receipt of appropriate supports and services.	*In 1998, 71.3% of families served by PTIs reported that the information and assistance received from the PTIs made a positive difference in their child's receipt of appropriate supports and services.*	6.2 PTI project impact data, 2000.

IDEA Part D--National Activities--$343,461,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To link best practices to states, school systems, and families to improve results for infants, toddlers, and children with disabilities.

Relation of Program to Strategic Plan: Goal 1: All students reach challenging academic standards ; objectives 1.4, 1.5 and 1.7. Goal 2: Build a solid foundation for learning; objective 2.4. Goal 4: Focus on results, service quality and customer satisfaction; objectives 4.1, 4..3, and 4.4.

Key Strategies

- Identify research-validated effective practices and link them to technical assistance, dissemination, personnel preparation and training programs.
- Require State Improvement Grant applications to include current data on regular and special education personnel employed, certification status, and training received.
- Promote innovative solutions to address the needs for an adequate supply of highly qualified personnel.
- Use selection criteria for grants that emphasize the usability of research knowledge.
- Provide technical assistance (TA), information, and support to grantees and potential consumers of research information on strategies (e.g., improved credibility, visibility, and communicability of research products) to enhance the use of research.
- Incorporate conditions into grant announcements that ensure TA and knowledge competencies and promote emphasis on effective practices in curriculum policies and services.
- Assess alternative TA and dissemination approaches and identify effective strategies that respond to customer needs.
- Provide TA and training to OSEP network of TA providers on effective strategies for increasing the use of research.
- Develop coordinated, collaborative strategies with other ED-funded providers of TA and information.
- Assess alternative TA approaches and identify effective strategies that respond to the needs of school districts and community-based providers.
- Provide TA and training on models and strategies for effective practices to OSEP network of TA providers.
- Provide TA and information to states to use in developing and implementing their State Improvement Plans.
- Promote partnerships among state and local agencies and organizations to ensure that the needs of children with disabilities and their families are met.
- Conduct research and disseminate information on accommodations that allow children with disabilities to participate in assessments and on developing alternative assessments.
- Promote coordination among providers of TA and information, both OSEP- supported and other Department providers.

Rehabilitation Services and Special Institutions

180

State Vocational Rehabilitation Services (including Supported Employment)--$2,353,739,000 (FY 2000)			
Goal : Individuals with disabilities served by the Vocational Rehabilitation State Grant program will achieve high quality employment.			
Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: These objectives support Strategic Plan Goal 3.4 ensuring access to services that provide adults with disabilities the opportunity to strengthen their skills and improve their earning power over their lifetime.			
Objectives	**Indicators**	**Performance Data**	**Sources, Periodicity, Next Update**
Consumer outcomes			
1. **Ensure that individuals with disabilities who are served by the Vocational Rehabilitation State Grant program achieve employment consistent with their particular strengths, resources, abilities, capabilities, and interests.**	1.1 **Number achieving employment.** The number of individuals with disabilities who achieve employment will increase by at least 1% annually.	*The number employed in 1997 was 211,520.*	1.1 Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) State data, annual, Dec. 31, 1999.
	1.2 **Percentage of individuals obtaining employment.** The percentage of all persons served who obtain employment will be maintained at 61% in FY 2000.	*The percentage obtaining employment in 1997 was 61%.*	1.2 Same as 1.1.
	1.3 **Percentage of individuals obtaining competitive employment.** Of individuals obtaining employment, the percentage who obtain competitive employment will increase to 83% by the end of FY 2000. Among individuals with significant disabilities obtaining employment, the percentage obtaining competitive employment will increase to 66% by the end of FY 2000.	*The percentage of all individuals with disabilities who obtained competitive employment in 1997 was 82%.* *The percentage of individuals with significant disabilities who obtained competitive employment in 1997 was 65%.*	1.3 Same as 1.1.
	1.4 **Improved earnings.** Among individuals exiting the program in competitive employment, the median ratio of their average hourly wage to the state's average hourly wage for all individuals in the state who are employed will increase to .58 by the end of FY 2000.	*In 1997, the median ratio for general and combined agencies was .57.*	1.4 Same as 1.1.
	1.5 **Own income as primary support**. The percentage of individuals who report upon obtaining employment that their own income is their primary source of support will increase to 75% in FY 2000.	*In 1997, the percentage was 74%.*	1.5 Same as 1.1.
	1.6 **Employment retention.** The percentage of individuals obtaining competitive employment who maintain employment and earnings 12 months after closure will be maintained at the 85% level in FY 2000.	*Data from the VR longitudinal study indicate that 85% of individuals were still employed 12 months after exiting the program.*	1.6 VR longitudinal study, May 2000; RSA is developing standards and indicators that will measure employment retention and satisfaction.

State Vocational Rehabilitation Services (including Supported Employment)--$2,353,739,000 (FY 2000)

Goal : Individuals with disabilities served by the Vocational Rehabilitation State Grant program will achieve high quality employment.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: These objectives support Strategic Plan Goal 3.4 ensuring access to services that provide adults with disabilities the opportunity to strengthen their skills and improve their earning power over their lifetime.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Sources, Periodicity, Next Update
	1.7 **Satisfaction with employment.** The percentage of individuals who are satisfied with their employment outcome will increase to 73% in FY 2000.	*1996 data from the VR longitudinal study indicate that about 72% of consumers were satisfied with their employment outcome.*	1.7 Same as 1.6.
Federal administration			
2. RSA will help states improve services and outcomes for consumers.	2.1 **Satisfaction with services.** The percentage of individuals who are satisfied with their VR services will increase to 77% in FY 2000.	*1996 data from the VR longitudinal study indicate that 76% of consumers are very or mostly satisfied with their VR services.*	2.1 Same as 1.6.
	2.2 **Basic monitoring and technical assistance**. RSA will complete its annual monitoring of 100% of the state VR agencies and provide technical assistance as needed. 2.3 **Comprehensive monitoring reviews.** RSA will conduct a minimum of 10 comprehensive, onsite, monitoring reviews each year and provide technical assistance as needed.	*In 1997, RSA monitored 91.5% of the state agencies (75 out of 82 agencies). In 1998, RSA monitored 98.8% of the state agencies (81 out of 82 agencies).* *In 1997, RSA conducted 9 such reviews. In 1998, RSA conducted 11 such reviews.*	2.2 RSA Central Office records, 1998. 2.3 Same as 2.2.
	2.4 **Availability and use of data.** The time required by RSA to produce an accessible national database will decrease until it reaches 6 months after the close of the fiscal year (March 31, 2001).	*FY 1997 database was available 14.5 months after the close of the fiscal year (December 15, 1998).*	2.4 Same as 2.2.
Consumer supported employment outcomes			
3. Increase the number of individuals with the most significant disabilities who have received supported employment services but achieve competitive employment outcomes.	3.1 **Percentage achieving competitive employment.** The percentage of individuals with a supported employment goal who achieve a competitive employment outcome (including supported employment outcomes in which the individual receives the minimum wage or better) will increase to 71.5% by the end of FY 2000.	*In FY 1997, the percentage of individuals with a supported employment goal who achieved a competitive employment outcome was 70.6 %.*	3.1 Supported Employment Caseload Report, annual, 1998.

State Vocational Rehabilitation Services (including Supported Employment)–$2,353,739,000 (FY 2000)

Goal : Individuals with disabilities served by the Vocational Rehabilitation State Grant program will achieve high quality employment.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: These objectives support Strategic Plan Goal 3.4 ensuring access to services that provide adults with disabilities the opportunity to strengthen their skills and improve their earning power over their lifetime.

Key Strategies

- Develop a monitoring and technical assistance plan for states, taking into consideration performance on program outcome measures.
- Develop a state improvement plan, with state agencies that are performing below established standards, to be included in regulations currently under development.
- Identify and disseminate information regarding effective practices for assisting individuals with disabilities to achieve appropriate employment outcomes and provide training as needed.
- Review, revise, and improve the issuance of RSA's policy and guidance directives to state VR agencies..
- Ensure that RSA staff are trained and able to effectively monitor state performance and provide technical assistance.
- Develop coordinated approaches among federal agencies (e.g., ED, DOL, HHS, and SSA) that affect employment of individuals with disabilities.

American Indian Vocational Rehabilitation Services--$23,390,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To improve employment outcomes of American Indians with disabilities who live on or near reservations by providing effective tribal vocational rehabilitation (VR) services

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: These objectives support Strategic Plan Goal 3.4 ensuring access to services that provide adults with disabilities the opportunity to strengthen their skills and improve their earning power over their lifetime.

Objective	Indicators	Performance Data	Sources, Periodicity, Next Update
1. **Ensure that eligible American Indians with disabilities receive vocational rehabilitation services and achieve employment outcomes consistent with their particular strengths, resources, abilities, capabilities, and interests.**	1.1 **Number of eligible individuals who receive services under the program.** By the end of FY 2000, a total of 4,100 American Indians with disabilities will receive services under an individualized plan for employment (IPE) from the 51 projects estimated to be in operation in FY 2000.	*During FY 1997, 2,617 individuals received VR services from 34 projects.* *During FY 1998, 3,243 individuals received VR services under an IPE from 39 projects*	1.1 Annual performance reports, onsite reviews, and project follow-up. Next update of annual data will be available December 31, 1999.
	1.2 **Number of eligible individuals who achieve employment outcomes.** By the end of FY 2000, a total of 770 American Indians with disabilities who received VR services under an IPE from the 51 projects estimated to be in operation during FY 2000, will achieve employment outcomes.	*During FY 1997, 530 individuals who received VR services under an IPE from 34 projects, achieved employment outcomes.* *During FY 1998, 598 individuals who received services under an IPE from 39 projects achieved employment outcomes.*	1.2 Same as 1.1.
	1.3 **Percentage of individuals who leave the program with employment outcomes.** By the end of FY 2000, the percentage of all eligible individuals receiving services under an IPE who exit the program and achieve an employment outcome will reach the comparable outcome rate for the state VR Services Program (61%).	*During FY 1998, 57% of those who left the program after receiving VR services under an IPE from 39 projects, had achieved employment outcomes.*	1.3 Same as 1.1.

American Indian Vocational Rehabilitation Services--$23,390,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To improve employment outcomes of American Indians with disabilities who live on or near reservations by providing effective tribal vocational rehabilitation (VR) services

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: These objectives support Strategic Plan Goal 3.4 ensuring access to services that provide adults with disabilities the opportunity to strengthen their skills and improve their earning power over their lifetime.

Key Strategies

- Support capacity-building activities to improve the number and quality of applications for AIVRS projects, through linkage with the National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research Centers on American Indian Vocational Rehabilitation and with capacity building grantees funded under Section 21 of the Act.
- Conduct an evaluation study that examines the consumer characteristics, services provided, outcomes, and management of the program.
- Establish a national training and technical assistance center during FY 1999 that will provide coordinated and comprehensive training of AIVRS staff to improve the effectiveness of the program.
- Through monitoring and technical assistance, provide guidance to projects in order to increase the scope of their outreach activities; improve their networking with other tribal and non-tribal agencies that are major referral sources; and provide interagency training to improve appropriateness of referrals.
- Conduct annual training conferences for all rehabilitation professionals participating and interested in AIVRS.
- Work toward building a network of higher education institutions that can deliver training to AIVRS staff through distance education strategies for undergraduate and graduate credit towards degrees in vocational rehabilitation. The network would include existing institutions that provide rehabilitation counselor training programs and existing Indian colleges.
- Continue to work closely with the Consortia of Administrators of Native American Rehabilitation (CANAR) to promote high-quality AIVRS programs and more qualified VR staff working in the AIVRS projects.

Client Assistance Program (CAP)--$10,928,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To provide assistance and information to help individuals with disabilities secure the benefits available under the Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants program and other programs funded under the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Supports the goals of the strategic plan by protecting the civil rights of individuals with disabilities who are seeking to strengthen their skills and improve their earning power.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Sources, Periodicity, Next Update
1. CAP programs meet expectations of individuals served in terms of their satisfaction with the CAP services received.	1.1 **Survey responses.** The percentage of CAPs achieving or exceeding the client satisfaction baseline will increase.		1.1 CAP grantee performance report, available April 1999.
2. Resolve cases at lowest possible level.	2.1 **Formal appeals or legal remedies.** The proportion of cases that involve formal appeals or legal remedies to resolve disputes will decrease.		2.1 CAP grantee performance report, available April 1999.
3. Accurately identify problem areas requiring systemic change and engage in systemic activity to improve services under the Rehabilitation Act.	3.1 **Systemic advocacy.** The percentage of CAPs conducting and reporting on their systemic advocacy activities will increase 3.2 **Effects of systemic change.** CAPs will report changes in policies and practices as a result of their efforts.		3.1 Narrative section of CAP grantee performance reports, 1999. 3.2 Same as 3.1.

Key Strategies

- Provide technical assistance on how CAPs should approach each case in a comprehensive manner.
- Provide technical assistance to CAPs on the use of the model client satisfaction survey.
- Provide technical assistance to encourage CAPs to follow up with individuals served.
- Inform National Association of Protection and Advocacy Systems (NAPAS) of ED activities in this area at monthly meetings.
- Develop a model ADR policy for the CAPs.
- Provide technical assistance on how CAPs can use ADR effectively.
- Compile and assess CAP narrative reporting regarding systemic activities in order to provide technical assistance and follow-up for those CAPs not reporting systemic activities.

Training Program--$41,629,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: **To provide the public vocational rehabilitation (VR) sector with well-trained staff and to maintain and upgrade the skills of current staff.**

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: These objectives support objective 4.1 (customer service). Providing the VR program with skilled practitioners and improving the skills and ability of current practitioners leads to improved outcomes for people with disabilities in the VR system. These objectives also support objective 3.2 of ED's strategic plan (financial aid and services to assist post-secondary students enroll and complete their educational program) as 75% of funds from long term training grant must be used for scholarship assistance.

Objective	Indicators	Performance Data	Sources, Periodicity, Next Update
1. To produce graduates who work within the VR system to help individuals with disabilities achieve their goals.	1.1 **Numbers trained**. The number of students trained and the number of 'payback' years generated will remain stable per dollar invested (adjusted for inflation). 1.2 **Percentage working**. The percentage of graduates fulfilling their payback requirements will increase.		1.1 Annual grantee reporting form. Baseline data will be collected in FY98, available June, 1999 1.2 Annual grantee reporting form and results of monitoring reviews. Baseline will be set by July 1999 using FY98 data.
2. Maintain and upgrade the knowledge and skills of personnel currently employed in the public vocational rehabilitation system.	2.1 **Increased skills**. Supervisors will report an increase in the skills of rehabilitation professionals after training.		2.1 FY99 task order. Findings will be used to establish baseline.

Key Strategies

- Provide grantees with clearer guidance through annual training conference, Project Director orientations, and Project Director letters on the purpose of ED program and ways to respond better to program goals.
- Task order of Regional Continuing Education Programs and In-service Training programs began in October of 1998.

Special demonstration programs--$16,942,000 (FY2000)

Goal: To expand, improve, or further the purposes of, activities authorized under the Act.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: These objectives and strategies are linked to Strategic Goal 3.4 so that adults can strengthen their skills and improve their earning power over their lifetime through lifelong learning.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Sources, Periodicity, Next Update
1. Demonstrate innovative approaches to the provision of vocational rehabilitation (VR) services through meeting local needs.	1.1 **Innovation.** The number of projects implementing innovative program elements (i.e. program design and strategies) to meet local service or specific population needs will increase.		1.1 FY99 task order will develop and field test a data collection instrument. Findings will be used to establish baseline.
2. Expand and improve the provision of state VR services.	2.1 **Incorporation by VR agencies.** The number of projects reporting that the state VR agencies incorporated their approach, as exemplified by purchases of services after completion of federal funding cycles, will increase.		2.1 Same as 1.1.
3. Disseminate information about successful new types or patterns of services or devices for individuals with disabilities.	3.1 **Dissemination.** The number of funded projects that disseminate information to state VR agencies and other funded projects and disability related organizations will increase.		3.1 Same as 1.1.

Key Strategies

- RSA will contract with an outside contractor to evaluate grantee best practices and develop a data collection instrument.
- RSA will provide technical assistance to all grantees in order to promote successful outcomes. Interaction with state VR will be emphasized.
- Informational Memos (IM) will identify and disseminate information to other grantees and state VR agencies regarding best practices.
- RSA will continue to convene annual project directors' meetings to disseminate information.
- RSA will use print and electronic media to disseminate information, including Project Directors' reports and presentation, and the contract findings (e.g., Manual of Project Director's meeting and Web sites of RSA and funded projects).

Migrant and Seasonal Farm-workers Program--$2,350,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To increase employment opportunities for migrant and seasonal farm-workers who have disabilities.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: The Migrant and Seasonal Farm-workers Program's goals and objectives are linked to the Department's strategic goals related to increased earning power through life-long learning.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
1. **Ensure that eligible migrant and seasonal farm-workers with disabilities receive vocational rehabilitation services and achieve employment**	1.1 **Numbers served.** The overall number of migrant and seasonal farm-workers with disabilities who receive services each year will increase. 1.2 **Individuals who achieve employment outcomes.** The overall percentage of migratory agricultural workers or seasonal farm-workers with disabilities who achieve employment each year will increase.		1.1 Annual Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) 911 data, 1999. 1.2 Annual Rehabilitation Services Administration 911 data and annual project performance reports, 1999.

Key Strategies

- ❖ Grantees are given clearer guidance on the purpose of ED program and ways to respond better to program goals. Ongoing technical assistance is provided to grantees who demonstrate difficulty or noncompliance with program standards.
- ❖ RSA works to coordinate grantee activities with the state Vocational Rehabilitation agency. Through national conference and other means, opportunities are provided for exemplary migrant projects to share information on methods and models for building strong partnerships with state VR and other migrant programs.
- ❖ RSA will conduct telephone monitoring twice a year to all continuing projects to assess program activities and provide technical assistance.
- ❖ RSA is conducting an internal review of performance reports to determine the effectiveness of the program in meeting its stated objectives. Working with other federal offices within and outside the Department, RSA will identify and provide opportunities for grantees to identify and exchange information addressing work disincentives affecting unemployed migrant workers with disabilities.

Recreation Program--$2,596,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To provide to individuals with disabilities recreation activities and related experiences that can be expected to aid in their employment, mobility, socialization, independence, and community integration.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan:

These objectives support the Department's strategic goals of lifelong learning through increased recreational opportunities for individuals with disabilities.

Objective	Indicators	Performance Data	Sources, Periodicity, Next Update
Project services			
1. **Ensure that recreation programs are sustained after federal funding ceases.**	1.1 **Project continuation.** By fall 2000, 87% of programs initiated since FY1993 will be continuing after federal funding has ended.	*1996 baseline: 85% continuing*	1.1 Quarterly telephone monitoring reports and Annual and Final Performance Reports.
2. **Ensure that recreation programs will maintain the same level of services.**	2.1 **Individuals served.** The recreation programs will maintain the same level of services to individuals served by program.	*In 1996, 60,000 individuals were served*	2.1 Projects Directors' meeting, FY 2000; final report on grantees, activities and outcomes; quarterly telephone monitoring reports; annual assessment of continuation project.

Key Strategies

- Give grantees clearer guidance on the purpose of the program and better ways to respond to program goals.
- The Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) is conducting an internal review of performance reports to determine the effectiveness of the program meeting its stated objectives.
- Through national conferences and other means, RSA will provide opportunities for exemplary recreation projects to share information on methods and models for building strong partnerships with other recreational providers and with state Vocational Rehabilitation agencies. Grantees will have an opportunity to present their programs and receive technical assistance from RSA.
- RSA will conduct quarterly telephone monitoring of all continuing projects to provide guidance and to determine whether the project will continue after federal funding ceases.
- RSA will work with other federal offices within and outside the Department.
- RSA will contact annually all projects whose federal funds just ended to determine whether the project is being sustained without federal support.

Protection & Advocacy of Individual Rights (PAIR)--$10,894,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: **To provide assistance and information to individuals with disabilities eligible for the PAIR program and conduct advocacy to ensure the protection of their rights under federal law.**

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Supports the goals of the strategic plan by protecting the civil rights of individuals with disabilities who are seeking to strengthen their skills and improve their earning power.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
1. Adequately identify priorities and objectives so that PAIR programs meet the needs of individuals with disabilities.	2.1 **Percentage of requests for service outside PAIR priorities.** The percentage of individuals seeking services whose concerns are not within the PAIRs stated priorities will decrease.		2.1 Grantee performance reports, 2000.
2. PAIR programs meet expectations of individuals served in terms of their satisfaction with the PAIR services received.	3.1 **Survey responses.** The percentage of PAIR programs achieving or exceeding the client satisfaction baseline will increase.		3.1 Same as 2.1.
3. Identify problem areas requiring systemic change and engage in systemic activities to address those problems.	4.1 **Policy changes.** The percentage of PAIRs that report changes in policies and practices as a result of their efforts will increase.		4.1 Same as 2.1.

Key Strategies

- Consult with PAIR grantees, the National Association of Protection and Advocacy Systems (NAPAS), and others on the development of key data collection elements.
- Assess findings from the PAIR program evaluation to identify additional measures for this program.
- Provide technical assistance to help PAIR programs identify appropriate priorities and objectives.
- Develop a model client satisfaction survey for PAIR programs to use.
- Provide technical assistance to encourage PAIR programs to follow up with individuals served.
- Compile and assess PAIR narrative reporting.
- Provide technical assistance and follow up for those PAIR programs not reporting systemic advocacy activities.

202

203

Projects with Industry (PWI), Section 611 — $22,071,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: **To facilitate the establishment of partnerships between rehabilitation service providers and business and industry in order to create and expand employment and career advancement opportunities for individuals with disabilities.**

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: These objectives support Strategic Plan Goal 3.4 ensuring access to services that provide adults with disabilities the opportunity to strengthen their skills and improve their earning power over their lifetime.

Objective	Indicators	Performance Data	Sources, Periodicity, Next Update
1. **Ensure that PWI services (through partnerships with business and industry) result in competitive employment, increased wages, and job retention for individuals with disabilities.**	1.1 **Placement rate of individuals with disabilities into competitive employment.** By fall 2000, 62% of the individuals served will be placed in competitive employment.	*In FY 1997, 59% of individuals served were placed in competitive employment.*	1.1 Grantee performance indicator data, annual, December 1999.
	1.2 **Change in earnings of individuals who are placed in competitive employment.** By fall 2000, PWI projects will report that participants placed in competitive employment increase earnings by an average of at least $210 per week.	*In FY 1997, PWI project reports showed that participants increased earnings by an average of $207 per week.*	1.2. Same as 1.1.
2. **Ensure that PWI services are available for individuals with the most need.**	2.1 **Percentage of individuals served who were unemployed for 6 months or more prior to program entry who are placed in competitive employment.** By fall 2000, 63% of previously unemployed individuals served will be placed into competitive employment.	*In FY 1997, 60% of previously unemployed individuals served were placed in competitive employment.*	2.1 Same as 1.1.

Key Strategies

- Provide ongoing technical assistance to grantees who demonstrate difficulty or noncompliance with the placement standards and the wage standard defined in PWI regulations. Monitor progress through off-site monitoring and progress reports.
- Through national conferences and other means, provide opportunities for exemplary PWI projects to share information on methods and models for building strong partnerships with industry, and with state Vocational Rehabilitation agencies. Include dissemination of information on effective Business Advisory Councils, including representatives from labor and from the disability community.
- Working with other federal offices within and outside the Department, identify and provide opportunities for grantees to identify and exchange information addressing work disincentives affecting previously unemployed individuals with disabilities. Provide technical assistance to grantees that demonstrate poor performance in placing previously unemployed.

Independent Living Programs--$84,574,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: **Individuals with significant disabilities served by the Title VII, Chapter 1 programs will achieve consumer-determined independent living goals (objectives 1-4); and Independent Living Services will be provided and activities conducted to improve or expand services to older individuals who are blind (objectives 5 & 6).**

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan:

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Sources, Periodicity, Next Update
Title VII, Chapter 1 programs: Part B, State Independent Living Services and Part C, Centers for Independent Living			
1. Increase the number of individuals with significant disabilities who are served by and benefit from the Title VII, Chapter 1 programs.	1.1 **Number of individuals with significant disabilities served, grouped by age.** The number of individuals who received individual independent living services will increase in *all* age categories. With 1997 as a base, 1999 data will indicate a 2% increase in population served, and 2000 data will indicate a 5% increase in every age group.	*The number of individuals receiving individual IL services in FY 1997 was as follows: under 6=1,544; 6 to 17=5,831; 18 to 22=10,529; 23 to 54=77,362; and 55 and older=44,245.*	1.1 Rehabilitation Services, Administration (RSA) 704 Reports (704 Report), annual, 1999.
	1.2 **Number of goals set and achieved by consumers.** The number of consumer goals set and achieved will increase in all service areas measured. By 1999 the numbers set and met will increase and the average proportion met will be 62.5%, the rate by the year 2000 will be 63%.	*The FY 1997 goals set and met and rate:* *Self-care 44,120 28,503 64.6%* *Communication 19,055 12,884 67.6%* *Mobility 20,211 13,334 65.9%* *Residential 20,589 12,121 58.8%* *Educational 19,058 13,754 72.2%* *Vocational 13,990 7,100 50.8%* *Other 39,516 22,913 58.0%* ***Total 176,539 110,609 62.3%***	1.2 Annual RSA 704 Report, 1998.
2. Increase the satisfaction of consumers who receive Chapter 1 Independent Living (IL) services.	2.1 **Consumer satisfaction with IL services.** A consistently high proportion of consumers will report satisfaction with IL services. These data will be uniformly reported by the 704 Report for 1998 and will meet the benchmark rate of 87% (very or mostly) satisfied by the year 2000.	*FY 1997 NY State survey indicated that of 85% of consumers are very or mostly satisfied with services.*	2.1 Annual 704 Report, State Plan for Independent Living (SPIL) Attachment 16. Beginning in 1998.
3. Improve access to personal assistance services (PAS), housing, transportation, and community-based living through increased advocacy efforts.	3.1 **Number of Centers for Independent Living (CILs) using effective advocacy techniques.** All CILs will have an advocacy program to address at least two of the following areas: (1). community-based PAS (2). accessible/ affordable housing (3). accessible/ affordable transportation, and (4). options moving people from nursing homes and other institutions to the community. By 2000 50% of CILS will meet this benchmark and by 2002, 100% of CILs will .	*Preliminary results from New York State indicate25% of that state's CILs have active advocacy programs in at least 2 of these areas.*	3.1 Annual RSA 704 Report, 1998.

Independent Living Programs--$84,574,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: **Individuals with significant disabilities served by the Title VII, Chapter 1 programs will achieve consumer-determined independent living goals (objectives 1-4); and Independent Living Services will be provided and activities conducted to improve or expand services to older individuals who are blind (objectives 5 & 6).**

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan:

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Sources, Periodicity, Next Update
	3.2 **Increased community-based living.** The number of individuals who leave nursing homes and other institutions for community-based housing and the number of individuals at risk of entering nursing homes and other institutions who are receiving IL services and can remain at home will increase. By 2000, will be measured, some 1,000 individuals leaving nursing homes and other institutions and 10,000 remaining at home will be reported.	*In FY 1998, 800 individuals left nursing homes and 8,000 remained in the community, estimated by RSA staff interviews of CIL executive directors.*	3.2 Annual RSA 704 Report, 1998.
4. **Increase the amount of funds in addition to Title VII that support Chapter 1 grantees .**	4.1 **Increased funding from alternative sources.** 75% of CILs will have greater than 25% of their budget from sources other than Title VII, Chapter 1 and 80% of states will contribute more than the required minimum match for Title VII, Chapter 1, Part B.	*FY 1997 data show that 74% of CILs receive more than 25% of their budget from other than Chapter 1, and that 80% of states more than match the Part B funds.*	4.1 Annual RSA 704 Report, 1998.
5. **Provide Chapter 2 services to increasing numbers of individuals who are older and severely visually impaired, and increase consumer satisfaction.**	5.1 **Increased number of individuals served.** The number of older and severely visually impaired individuals served will increase. By 2000, 35,000 older blind and significantly disabled individuals will be receiving services each year.	*In FY 1996, 26,846 individuals received services.*	5.1 Annual Report -- Independent Living Services for Older Individuals Who Are Blind (7OB Annual Report), 1997.
	5.2 **Increased consumer satisfaction.** By 2000, there will be a 90% satisfaction rate among individuals who receive services and are evaluated.	*A preliminary baseline of 90% satisfaction comes from data gathered in a voluntary sample.* *Baseline data are being gathered by a contractor in FY 1998. These data will be used to establish a national benchmark for the Chapter 2 program.*	5.2 7OB Annual Report and new consumer satisfaction addendum in the revised 7OB Report.
6. **Increase funding for Chapter 2 programs from sources other than Title VII, Chapter 2.**	6.1 **Increased funding from alternative sources.** An increasing number of states contribute more than the minimum match amount. The target is 80% for 2000.	*75% in FY 1996.*	6.1 7OB Annual Report.

Independent Living Programs--$84,574,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: Individuals with significant disabilities served by the Title VII, Chapter 1 programs will achieve consumer-determined independent living goals (objectives 1-4); and Independent Living Services will be provided and activities conducted to improve or expand services to older individuals who are blind (objectives 5 & 6).

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan:

Key Strategies

- Develop technical assistance action plans to assist grantees that are performing below standards and indicators of compliance.
- Identify and disseminate information regarding best practices for helping individuals with disabilities to achieve appropriate independent living outcomes.
- Develop a monitoring and technical assistance plan for states and CILs, taking into consideration performance on the indicators, requests for assistance, date of last on-site review, and annual financial audit.
- Identify and assist low-performing service providers and CILs.
- With training and technical assistance providers, provide coordinated assistance to CILs on advocacy techniques and strategies.
- Present information at national meetings of CIL directors on the importance of facilitating community change.
- Present national experts on affordable/ accessible housing and transportation, PASs, and community-based living arrangements at RSA National DSU & SILC Meeting to focus emphasis and encourage new state and local efforts. Primary focus in FY 1999 will be on housing.
- Identify and publish potential funds availability, increase grantees' capacity to obtain grants, and identify and share replicable model local and state resource development techniques and strategies.
- Identify significant outcomes of the Chapter 1 programs and disseminate results to grantees and other potential funding sources.
- Provide technical assistance at national project directors meeting as to the most successful strategies and techniques for increasing and improving service.
- Conduct an independent consumer satisfaction review of all grantees.
- Identify and assist state agencies and CILs with low consumer satisfaction rates.
- RSA will aggregate and share with grantees innovative methods of supporting Chapter 2 activities from sources other than Chapter 2.
- RSA will aggregate examples of outcomes of the Chapter 2 program and share them with grantees and other potential funding sources.

Helen Keller National Center (HKNC) for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults--$8,550,000 (FY2000)

Goal: Individuals who are deaf-blind will become independent and function as full and productive members of their local community.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: These objectives support Strategic Plan Objectively 3.4 ensuring access to services that provide adults with disabilities the opportunity to strengthen their skills and improve their earning power over their lifetime.

Objective	Indicators	Performance Data	Sources, Periodicity, Next Update
1. Ensure that individuals who are deaf-blind receive the specialized services and training they need to become as independent and self-sufficient as possible.	1.1 **Services to consumers at headquarters.** The training program at headquarters will serve a minimum of 85 adult consumers and 12 high school students, while the percent of consumers placed in employment settings and the percentage who return to less restrictive living situations will be maintained or increase. *Target: The target for 2000 is 90 adults and 12 high school students in the HQ training program, 40% placements in employment, and 25% in less restrictive living situations.*	*In 1998, a total of 91 adult consumers and 12 high school students received training at HKNC headquarters; 21, or 36%, of the 58 adult consumers completing training were placed in employment settings; and 14, or 25%, of the 58 clients completing training returned to less restrictive living situations.*	1.1 Internal client caseload reports summarized in the HKNC Annual Report for 1998.
	1.2 **Clients improve functionally**. Participants in the training program at headquarters will increase their skills and abilities in areas such as communication, orientation and mobility, and independent living. *Target will be established upon receipt of baseline data..*		1.2 Annual Report, 1999.
2. Ensure that deaf-blind consumers and their family members receive the services they need to function more independently in the home community.	2.1 **Regional services to consumers and families.** HKNC will maintain or increase the number of consumers and family members served through its regional offices. *Target for 2000 is 1,250 consumers and 400 family members.*	*In 1998, 1,259 individuals with deal-blindness and 402 families were served by the regional offices.*	2.1 Annual Report, 1998.
3. Increase the capacity of the adult service system to meet the training and support needs of deaf-blind persons in their local community.	3.1 **Training for professionals, organizations/ agencies &affiliate membership.** The number of agencies and organizations receiving training from HKNC will be maintained or increased. *Target will be established upon receipt of baseline data.*		3.1 Annual Report, 1999.

Helen Keller National Center (HKNC) for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults–$8,550,000 (FY2000)

Goal: Individuals who are deaf-blind will become independent and function as full and productive members of their local community.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: These objectives support Strategic Plan Objectively 3.4 ensuring access to services that provide adults with disabilities the opportunity to strengthen their skills and improve their earning power over their lifetime.

Key Strategies

- Develop an internal document, the Individualized Training Plan (ITP), to document short-term goals and their completion.
- Provide training to staff to increase and improve their qualifications, expertise, and job performance.
- Conduct a follow-up survey to obtain data on employment status and satisfaction with community living (housing, community participation and supports) and to gain information on goals completed 1 year after students leave the HKNC training program.
- Conduct periodic consumer surveys to determine satisfaction with field services.
- As appropriate, include input from family members into the process for identifying goals for the ITP. Conduct regular review (every 13 weeks) with the family to assess progress.
- Conduct national parent meetings, with agendas developed through a needs assessment completed by parents.
- Increase the number of university affiliations and student internships offered.
- Develop a brochure to market the availability of community-based consultations and disseminate it through the regional offices.
- Conduct participant assessments of training activities using competency-based evaluations.
- Develop a national database of federal, state, and regional offices and staff and other service providers in order to improve HKNC's networking, coordinating, collaborating, and training activities.
- Provide an annual affiliate training meeting
- Fund new affiliates annually.
- Maximize the effectiveness of professional training through the use of a person-centered approach. Increase number of local teams receiving training vs. the single agency staff.

National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR)--$90,964,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: **To support the conduct and dissemination of high-quality research that contributes to improvement in the quality of life of persons with disabilities**

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: These objectives support Goal 2 Objective 4 related to special populations and Goal 4.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Sources, Periodicity, Next Update
1. Conduct high-quality research that leads to high-quality research products.	1.1 **Scientific excellence.** By 2002, peer evaluation will find that grantee research quality is good or excellent, as reflected in research design, sample sizes, and analytical methods, for 80% of projects. 1.2 **Research usefulness.** By 2002, 80% of customers will agree that grantee research is useful; the biennial increase will be 20%. 1.3 **Increased publication and citation.** Publication of research findings, with the appropriate citation, will increase in refereed journals and other recognized forums by 10% annually.		1.1 Baseline from program reviews (1996 - 1998);Prospective and in-process peer evaluation, initiated in 1996. 1.2 Biennial customer inquiry (2002), annual consensus conferences on various topics, 1999. 1.3 Analysis of grantee records and reports; literature search, annual, 1999.
2. Disseminate and promote use of information on research findings, in accessible formats, to improve rehabilitation services and outcomes.	2.1 **Dissemination plan**. By 2000, 80% of grantees will include a dissemination plan that identifies target audiences. 2.2 **Product availability.** By 2001, 75% of grantee products and 90% of NIDRR products will be available in alternative formats: cognitive accessibility, sensory accessibility. 2.3 **Information and TA usefulness**. By 2001, at least 90% of recipients find the products, information, and technical assistance that they receive useful.		2.1 Analysis of grantee dissemination plans, annual, 1999. 2.2 Analysis of a sample of grantee products, 1999. 2.3 Customer survey, biennial 1999.
3. Expand system capacity for conduct of high-quality rehabilitation research and services by ensuring availability of qualified researchers and practitioners, including persons with disabilities and other under-served groups.	3.1 **Contribution of trainees and fellows.** By 2002, the contributions by NIDRR trainees and fellows to the field of rehabilitation research will increase by 25%. 3.2 **Researchers with disabilities and from under-served groups.** Over a 5-year period, the number of researchers working in the field who have disabilities or are from under-served groups will increase by 25%.		3.1 Analysis of trainee/fellow documentation of employment, 2000. 3.2 NIDRR-sponsored survey, 2002.

National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR)--$90,964,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: **To support the conduct and dissemination of high-quality research that contributes to improvement in the quality of life of persons with disabilities**

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: These objectives support Goal 2 Objective 4 related to special populations and Goal 4.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Sources, Periodicity, Next Update
	3.3 **Impact on field.** Over a 5-year period, the number of practitioners who report that NIDRR-funded research and training activities make a significant contribution to professional development in the field will increase by 25%.		3.3 Biennial customer survey, 2000.
4. **Ensure productivity and management effectiveness.**	4.1 **Relevant priorities.** Priority setting will respond to needs articulated by researchers, consumers, practitioners, and policymakers and will reflect advances in the state of knowledge and progress toward agency goals. 4.2 **Usefulness of NIDRR products.** The percentage of customers reporting that NIDRR products and information are useful will increase by 10% biennially.		4.1 Public hearings; analysis of public comments on priorities, annual, expert panel review, 1999. 4.2 Customer survey, biennial, 2002.

Key Strategies

- Provide training for prospective peer review panels.
- Develop cooperative training activities with RSA/state VR.
- Emphasize the training of graduate researchers in all centers, and encourage grantees to target persons with disabilities and individuals from under-served groups.
- Publish and distribute accessibility guidelines for publications, meetings, and W
- web sites, and provide a model of accessibility in NIDRRs own products, communications,
and meetings.
- Develop targeted Dissemination and Utilization (D&U) projects.
- Survey consumer and provider needs.
- Involve broad constituency in planning, priority setting, and program reviews.
- Convene conferences of consumers and researchers to identify emerging issues in disability research and service delivery.
- Develop pre-college awareness programs that target disabled persons and individuals from under-served groups.
- Contract an impact study to assess productivity, relevance, and quality of research.
- Complete case studies of the impact of research on selected topics.
- Implement customer evaluation on a program-by-program basis.
- Contract a comprehensive study of Nadirs historical accomplishments as basis for setting future directions.

1996 baseline: 75% continuing. FY 1998 data will be reported in December 1998

Assistive Technology Program--$45,000,000 (FY2000)

Goal : To increase availability of, funding for, access to, and provision of assistive technology devices and assistive technology services.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Goal 2. – objective 2.4 – individuals with disabilities will receive technology enabling them to learn, contribute and participate in school consistent with overall high standards; Goal 3. – objective 3.1 and 3.4 – secondary school students and adults with disabilities are provided with accessible information and the technology to support their job potential and lifelong learning; Goal 4. – objective 4.4 – all technology investments are accessible to all users including employees and customers.

Objective	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
1. Through systemic activity, improve access to and availability of assistive technology (AT) for individuals with disabilities who require assistive technology.	1.1 **Information.** The number of individuals with disabilities and service providers who receive information about AT will increase by 10% annually.	*In FY96, 191,623 individuals received information.*	**1.1 - 1.3.** All 56 states have responded to National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR) Performance Guidelines, with baseline figures for FY96. This is an annual report.
	1.2 **Trained professionals.** The number of professionals trained to provide AT services will increase by 5% in the year 2000.	*In FY96, 198,966 persons were trained.*	
	1.3 **Timeliness.** The waiting time for AT services from public agencies will be reduced by 10% in the year 2000.		
	1.4 **Barrier reduction.** Annually, each grantee's activities will result in legislative and policy changes that reduce barriers.	*In FY97, 84% of the 56 grantees were responsible for at least one legislative change, 95% were responsible for policy changes in 2 or more areas.*	**1.4** Annual report narrative.
	1.5 **VR consumers.** The number of vocational rehabilitation (VR) consumers who receive assistive technology will increase by 10% in the year 2000..		**1.5** Rehabilitation Services Administration Annual Report, 1997.
2. Through systemic activity, increase funding for assistive technology devices and services.	2.1 **Funding sources**. Each year, 10 additional states will institute policies that result in private insurance payments for AT.		**2.1** Annual report narrative.
	2.2 **Information**. The number of individuals with disabilities and service providers who receive information about the funding of AT will increase by 10% annually.		**2.2** Responses to NIDRR Annual Performance Guidelines, 1998.

Assistive Technology Program--$45,000,000 (FY2000)

Goal : To increase availability of, funding for, access to, and provision of assistive technology devices and assistive technology services.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Goal 2. – objective 2.4 – individuals with disabilities will receive technology enabling them to learn, contribute and participate in school consistent with overall high standards; Goal 3. – objective 3.1 and 3.4 – secondary school students and adults with disabilities are provided with accessible information and the technology to support their job potential and lifelong learning; Goal 4. – objective 4.4 – all technology investments are accessible to all users including employees and customers.

Key Strategies

- Provide technical assistance to states on accessibility issues.
- Attend meetings of professional organizations for special education and vocational rehabilitation, and provide technical assistance; disseminate information about successful activities developed between education programs for children with disabilities and Tech Act projects.
- Increase collaboration with state VR agencies.
- Monitor Tech Act reports for indications of reduction in the number of barriers to accessing assistive technology by underrepresented populations and rural populations; disseminate information about successful activities to eliminate barriers.
- Provide technical assistance and disseminate information to AT grantees about funding of AT services and devices.

American Printing House for the Blind--$8,973,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: Pre-college level blind students will receive appropriate educational materials which result in improved educational outcomes.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: APH's activities support objectives 2.1 (children enter school ready to learn), 2.2 (reading), 2.3 (math), 2.4 (special populations) in addition to objective 3.1 (Secondary students—information & support) through its production and distribution of educational materials adapted for students who are legally blind and enrolled in formal educational programs below the college level.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Sources, Periodicity, Next Update
1. Appropriate, timely, high-quality educational materials are provided to pre-college level blind students to allow them to benefit more fully from their educational programs.	1.1 **Customer satisfaction.** In FY 2000, 96% of APH's customers/consumers will agree that the educational materials provided through the Act are appropriate, timely, and of high quality and allow blind students to benefit more fully from their educational programs.	*In 1998, the ex officio trustees reported that 95% of customers/consumers indicated that the educational materials were appropriate, timely, and of high quality, and allow blind students to benefit from their educational programs.* *Additional baseline data from a consumer survey will be available later in 1999.*	1.1 Survey of Ex Officio Trustees, annual, 1999; Input from Research and Publications Advisory Committees, annual, 1999; Consumer surveys, ongoing, 1999.
	1.2 **Student performance and participation.** In FY 2000, the percentage of APH ex officio trustees who report that the performance of students and their participation in their educational programs improves as a result of the availability of educational materials provided through the Act will increase to 99%.	*In 1998, 98% of the ex officio trustees reported that student performance and participation in their education programs improved.* *Additional baseline data from the survey of Teachers will be available later in 1999.*	1.2 Annual survey of Ex Officio Trustees, 1999; Annual survey of teachers, 1999.
2. Research will result in identification and development of educational materials responsive to consumer needs.	2.1 **Responsiveness to needs.** In 2000, the percentage of APH ex officio trustees who express satisfaction with the prioritization of APH's research projects will increase to 95%.	*In 1998, 94% expressed satisfaction with the prioritization of APH's research projects.*	2.1 Survey of Ex Officio Trustees, annual, 1999; input from the Educational and Technical Research Advisory Committee, annual, 1999.
3. Advisory services help service providers to become knowledgeable about how to most effectively use products provided through the Act.	3.1 **Effectiveness of assistance.** In 2000, the percentage of service providers who agree that APH's advisory services help them become knowledgeable about the effective use of products provided through the Act will increase to 99%.	*In 1998, 98% of service providers agreed that APH's advisory services helped them become knowledgeable about the use of APH products.*	3.1 Survey of Ex Officio Trustees, annual, 1999; evaluations of technical assistance to direct service providers, periodic, 1999.

224

225

American Printing House for the Blind--$8,973,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: Pre-college level blind students will receive appropriate educational materials which result in improved educational outcomes.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: APH's activities support objectives 2.1 (children enter school ready to learn), 2.2 (reading), 2.3 (math), 2.4 (special populations) in addition to objective 3.1 (Secondary students—information & support) through its production and distribution of educational materials adapted for students who are legally blind and enrolled in formal educational programs below the college level.

Key Strategies

- American Printing House for the Blind's existing survey of ex officio trustees will be conducted triennially beginning in 1998. Surveys targeting select issues will be conducted in each of the interim years.
- The Educational and Technical Research and the Publications Advisory Committees will annually review APH's progress in improving the appropriateness, timeliness of delivery, and quality of products produced through the Act.
- Ongoing surveys of consumers will be conducted by an outside vendor to provide data regarding the appropriateness, timeliness of delivery, and quality of products produced through the Act.
- Ex officio trustees will be surveyed to better understand how materials provided though the Act impact on student performance and how to measure the impact.
- Surveys of ex-officio trustees and teachers will be conducted on an annual basis to collect data regarding student performance and participation in their educational programs in relation to materials provided through the Act.
- An area of the annual survey of Ex Officio Trustees will be dedicated to collecting data regarding the match between APH's research priorities and product needs in the field.
- Beginning with 1998 meetings of the Educational and Technical Research Advisory Committee, research project prioritization, progress reports, and timelines will be reviewed for committee input.
- A section of the annual survey of ex officio trustees to collect data on the satisfaction of service providers with advisory services provided through the Act.
- When technical assistance is provided during FY 1999, participants will be requested to complete evaluations to indicate their satisfaction regarding the assistance.

National Technical Institute for the Deaf--$47,925,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To provide deaf and hearing students in undergraduate programs and professional studies with state-of-the-art technical and professional education programs, undertake a program of applied research; share NTID expertise and expand outside sources of revenue.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: The National Technical Institute for the Deaf programs support objectives 1.4 (teachers), 3.1 (secondary students-information/support), 3.2 (postsecondary students-financial aid/support), 3.4 (lifelong learning).

Objective	Indicators	Performance Data	Sources, Periodicity, Next Update
1. Provide deaf and hearing students in undergraduate and professional studies with outstanding state-of-the-art technical and professional education programs, complemented by a strong arts and sciences curriculum and supplemented with appropriate student support services.	1.1 **Enrollment**. In 2000, a student body of at least 1,080 undergraduate students, 100 educational interpreter program students, and 50 graduate students will be enrolled.	*In Fall 199, undergraduate enrollment was 1,135, educational interpreter program enrollment was 93, and graduate enrollment was 50 students.*	1.1 NTID Registrar Office records, Fall 1999 enrollment summarized in NTID's annual report, submitted in 2000.
2. Maximize the number of students successfully completing a program of study.	2.1 **Student retention rate**. The first-year student retention rate will rise to 73% in 2000. 2.2 **Graduation rate**. In 2000, the overall graduation rate will be maintained at 52% or 48% for sub-baccalaureate and 62% for baccalaureate.	*The FY 1998 first-year student retention rate was 71%.* *The most recent graduation rates for students in sub-baccalaureate programs and baccalaureate programs are 48% and 63 % (which exceeded our target of 62%).*	2.1 NTID Registrar Office records, summarized in the FY 1999 annual report, submitted in 2000. 2.2 NTID Registrar Office records, summarized in the FY 1999 annual report, submitted in 2000.
3. Prepare graduates to find satisfying jobs in fields commensurate with their education.	3.1 **Placement rate**. An overall 95% placement rate of graduates in the workforce will be maintained through 2000.	*The 1997 placement rate was 97% (which exceeded our 94% target).*	3.1 Placement Office records, summarized in the FY 1999 annual report, submitted in 2000.
Undertake a program of applied research to enhance the social, economic, and educational well-being of deaf people			
4. Conduct a program of applied research to provide innovative support for the teaching and learning process for deaf and hard-of-hearing individuals. 228	4.1 **Public input satisfaction assessments.** Conduct periodic assessments to determine whether NTID is obtaining appropriate public input on all deafness-related research, development, and demonstration activities. *Target will be established upon receipt of baseline data.*		4.1 Research Report, FY 2000 annual report, submitted in 2001. 229

National Technical Institute for the Deaf–$47,925,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: **To provide deaf and hearing students in undergraduate programs and professional studies with state-of-the-art technical and professional education programs, undertake a program of applied research; share NTID expertise and expand outside sources of revenue.**

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: The National Technical Institute for the Deaf programs support objectives 1.4 (teachers), 3.1 (secondary students-information/support), 3.2 (postsecondary students-financial aid/support), 3.4 (lifelong learning).

Objective	Indicators	Performance Data	Sources, Periodicity, Next Update
5. **Conduct outreach programs for external audiences to increase the knowledge base and improve practice in the field.**	5.1 **Consumer satisfaction.** In 2000, trained participants indicate an above-average rating for the training they receive to serve or work with individuals who are deaf and hard-of-hearing. *Target will be established upon receipt of baseline data.*		5.1 Summary of participant evaluations, annually, 2000.

Key Strategies

- ❖ Register 350 to 370 new students annually through a comprehensive marketing plan that targets minority students, women students, transfer students, international students, and cross-registered students.
- ❖ Provide a barrier-free communication environment within NTID and improve informational access on the Rochester Institute of Technology (RIT) campus for deaf and hard-of-hearing students.
- ❖ Continually evaluate the need to revise existing curriculum and develop new majors to reflect the changing needs of students and industry.
- ❖ Develop and refine retention initiatives (e.g., early warning system, career restoration program, peer support system, mentoring).
- ❖ Develop and implement instructional practices, including sign language and English to enable under-prepared students to acquire the skills necessary to complete a postsecondary program of study.
- ❖ Expand and enhance career opportunities for students by responding to changes in the field.
- ❖ Enhance the curriculum to ensure that graduates meet the requirements of national and state certifying boards.
- ❖ Provide an array of academic support counseling (e.g., career and personal counseling, academic and employment advisement, placement assistance).
- ❖ Explore new technical career areas that will ensure student's access to emerging careers that can enhance their earning potential.
- ❖ NTID will develop a strategy for determining field satisfaction related to its mechanisms for obtaining public input on research, development, and demonstration activities.
- ❖ Conduct research that advances our knowledge of educational challenges (e.g., reading college-level materials, transfer of skills across domains, matching educational interpreting to student needs) and understanding of the academic potential of deaf and hard-of-hearing students, including students with special needs, in order to optimize their academic success.
- ❖ Make presentations to state/regional meetings of state coordinators and/or RCDs to provide information on the latest developments on our campus.
- ❖ Conduct workshops; publish research results and provide electronic access to summaries of research findings; present research findings; and maintain active and visible roles with key educational and advocacy organizations.

Gallaudet University--$85,120,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To challenge students who are deaf, and students who are deaf and hearing in graduate programs, to achieve their academic goals and attain productive employment; provide leadership in setting the national standard for best practices in education of the deaf and hard of hearing; and establish a sustainable resource base.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Gallaudet University's programs and activities, including those at MSSD/KDES, support objectives 1.4 (teachers), 2.1 (children ready to learn), 2.2 (reading), 2.3 (math), 2.4 (Special populations), 3.1 (Secondary students-information & support), and 3.4 Lifelong learning.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Sources, Periodicity, Next Update
Gallaudet challenges students who are deaf to achieve their academic goals and attain productive employment.			
1. University Programs and KDES/MSSD will optimize the number of students completing programs of study.	1.1 **Enrollment at Gallaudet University.** In 2000, enroll 1,250 undergraduate and 700 graduate students, 70 students in professional studies, and 225 students at MSSD and 140 students at KDES.	*In FY 1998 (school year 1997-98), undergraduate enrollment was 1,339; graduate enrollment* was *714; and professional enrollments 224 in MSSD and 137 in KDES.*	1.1 Office of Enrollment Services records, Fall 1999 enrollment summarized in Gallaudet's annual report, submitted in 2000.
	1.2 **Student persistence rate.** By 2000, increase the undergraduate persistence rate to 76% in 2000; and the KDES/MSSD retention rate to 90%.	*In FY 1998, the undergraduate persistence rate was 72%, and the rate for KDES/MSSD was 85%.*	1.2 Office of the Enrollment Services records, summarized in the FY 1999 annual report, submitted in 2000.
	1.3 **Student graduation rate.** By 2000, increase the undergraduate graduation rate at the university will increase to 42%. The MSSD graduation rate will increase to 94% between 2000 and 2003.	*In FY 1998, the graduation rate for undergraduates was 41% and the rate was 93% for MSSD.*	1.3 Office of the Registrar records for collegiate enrollments and Office of Exemplary Programs and Research records for KDES/MSSD students, to be summarized in the FY 1999 annual report, submitted in 2000.
2. Curriculum and extra-curricular activities prepare students to meet the skill requirements of the workplace or to continue their studies.	2.1 **Employment and advanced studies opportunities at the University.** In 2000, 95% of Gallaudet's BA/BS graduates will either find jobs commensurate with their training and education or will attend graduate school during their first year after graduation; 25% of the Gallaudet students will apply to and be accepted into programs of advanced study beyond the baccalaureate degree.	*In 1997, 95% of BA/BS graduates were in jobs or graduate school their first year after graduation; 25% of the graduates in 1996 were accepted into programs of advanced studies.*	2.1 University studies on the status of graduates' employment, and results of employer surveys, February 1999, and the graduate follow-up studies, February 1999.

Gallaudet University–$85,120,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: **To challenge students who are deaf, and students who are deaf and hearing in graduate programs, to achieve their academic goals and attain productive employment; provide leadership in setting the national standard for best practices in education of the deaf and hard of hearing; and establish a sustainable resource base.**

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Gallaudet University's programs and activities, including those at MSSD/KDES, support objectives 1.4 (teachers), 2.1 (children ready to learn), 2.2 (reading), 2.3 (math), 2.4 (Special populations), 3.1 (Secondary students-information & support), and 3.4 Lifelong learning.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Sources, Periodicity, Next Update
Gallaudet provides leadership in setting the national standard for best practices in education of the deaf and hard of hearing			
3. **Research conducted contributes to high-quality state-of-the-art educational services for deaf and hard of hearing individuals.**	3.1. **Public input satisfaction.** Conduct periodic assessments to determine whether the university and KDES/MSSD are obtaining appropriate public input on all deafness-related research, development, and demonstration activities from infancy through adulthood, and to determine levels of satisfaction for these activities. Target will be established upon receipt of baseline data.		3.1 Report on Assessment on public input, summarized in the FY 2000 Annual Report, submitted in 2001.
4. **Gallaudet works in partnership with others to develop and disseminate educational programs and materials for deaf and hard-of-hearing students.**	4.1 **Use of KDES/MSSD expertise.** In 2000, the level of 41 programs and institutions adopting innovative curricula and other products, or modifying their strategies as a result of KDES/MSSD's leadership will be maintained or increased.	*In FY 1998, 41 programs had adopted KDES/MSSD innovative strategies/curricula.*	4.1 FY 1999 KDES/MSSD Annual Report, submitted in 2000.

Key Strategies

- KDES/MSSD will establish annual enrollment goals intended to achieve the requirements of the Education of the Deaf Act (EDA) related to composition of the student body.
- Incorporate strategies from studies conducted by Gallaudet into the university's Retention Improvement Plan and determine factors related to graduation completion rates.
- Information on employment status and additional education obtained by graduates to all academic and support departments to enhance their internal program reviews.
- KDES/MSSD will develop a comprehensive plan to provide students with transition skills, instruction, and exposure to workplace environments.
- The university will increase its support for implementation of research results on campus and at other universities.
- The university and KDES/MSSD will develop a strategy for determining field satisfaction related to its mechanisms for obtaining public input on research, development and demonstration activities.
- KDES/MSSD will obtain public input on research related to best practices in the priority areas of family involvement, transition, and literacy.
- KDES/MSSD will support research on KDES/MSSD priorities by university faculty, KDES/MSSD teachers, and staff through Gallaudet's internal RFP process.
- KDES/MSSD will develop partnerships and collaborations with a wide variety of other school programs serving deaf and hard-of-hearing children to identify, develop, test, and disseminate information about best practices and effective educational innovations.
- KDES/MSSD will develop and implement a national communications network in collaboration with the Gallaudet University Regional Centers.
- Gallaudet will expand programs that best meet the needs of deaf and hard-of-hearing persons, their families and the professionals who serve them.

Vocational and Adult Education

236

237

Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Act (State Grants and Tech-Prep Indicators)--$1,141,650,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: **Increase access to and improve educational programs that strengthen education achievement, workforce preparation, and lifelong learning.**

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Funds provided to states through vocational education state grants support the six objectives outlined in our program plan. These objectives have been aligned with core measures identified in Perkins III, which states will use to promote continuous program improvement in academic achievement and job skills attainment, and to promote positive student outcomes at the state and local levels. State performance measures and GPRA program plan objectives are now aligned with the Department's Strategic Plan, objective 1.2, which states, "Every state has a school-to-work system that increases student achievement, improves technical skills, and broadens career opportunities for all."

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
Student Achievement			
1. **Ensure that vocational concentrators, including special populations, will achieve high levels of proficiency in math, science and English.** **Students who complete 3 or more Carnegie units in a single specific labor market preparation program area*	1.1 **Academic attainment.** By fall of 2002, the percentage of vocational concentrators, including special populations, meeting the New Basics standards will double from baseline data. 1.2 **Academic attainment.** By fall 2002 (controlling for 8th grade math proficiency), vocational concentrators will show increased math gains between grades 8-12.	*Between 1992 and 1994, the percentage of vocational concentrators meeting new basic standards increased from 18.5% to 33.5%.* *In 1992, vocational concentrators, who scored in the lowest, middle, and highest range on an 8th grade math test showed gains of 19%, 22% and 26%, respectively, on math tests by grade 12.*	1.1 NAEP90, NAEP94; next update: NAEP transcript study, 1998.(available in 2000). 1.2 NELS88; update from NLSY in 2000.
2. **Ensure that institutions, secondary and postsecondary, will offer programs with industry-recognized skill standards so that concentrators, including special populations, can earn skill certificates in these programs.**	2. **Skills proficiencies.** By fall 2000, there will be an increasing proportion of vocational schools with skill competencies and related assessments, and with industry-recognized skill certificates in secondary and postsecondary institutions.	*Secondary--In 1996-97, 28 % of public schools had skill standards, 20% issued skills certificates, and 20% issued occupational certificates.* *Postsecondary--In 1990, 15 % of beginning postsecondary students had taken a licensing exam by 1994.*	2.1 Secondary--NLSY 1996-97 Update in 2000. Postsecondary--BPS: 94 (draft pub., Voc. Ed. 2000, Table 108).update, 2000. NCES Survey of Secondary and Postsecondary Institutions, 1999.
3. **Ensure that concentrators, including special populations, make transitions to continuing education, work, or other career options.**	3.1 **Secondary student outcomes.** By 2002, an increasing proportion of vocational concentrators, including special populations will: • Attain high school diplomas, • Enter postsecondary programs, or • Attain employment.	*In 1994, 52% of vocational concentrators graduating from high school in 1992 were enrolled in postsecondary education.* *In 1993, 77% of 1992 public high school graduates, who were vocational concentrators, were employed.*	3.1 State Performance Reports, annual, 2000 NELS, 2nd follow-up, Interim updates from 1996 STW Transcript Study/Postsecondary follow-up. High School and Beyond, 4th Follow-up, 1992, (draft pub., Voc. Ed. 2000, Table 61). Follow-up-2000. Interim updates from 1996 STW Transcript Study/ Postsecondary follow-up.

Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Act (State Grants and Tech-Prep Indicators)--$1,141,650,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: Increase access to and improve educational programs that strengthen education achievement, workforce preparation, and lifelong learning.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Funds provided to states through vocational education state grants support the six objectives outlined in our program plan. These objectives have been aligned with core measures identified in Perkins III, which states will use to promote continuous program improvement in academic achievement and job skills attainment, and to promote positive student outcomes at the state and local levels. State performance measures and GPRA program plan objectives are now aligned with the Department's Strategic Plan, objective 1.2, which states, "Every state has a school-to-work system that increases student achievement, improves technical skills, and broadens career opportunities for all."

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
	3.2 Postsecondary student outcomes. By 2002,an increasing proportion of vocational students, including special populations, will achieve the following outcomes: ➢ Retention in and completion of a postsecondary degree or certificate, or ➢ Placement in military service, or ➢ Placement or retention in employment	*In 1992, 10 years after graduating from high school in 1982, 48% of vocational concentrators had attained some type of credential, 13 % had certificates, 13% had an associate degree, and 22 % had a bachelor's degree..* *0.9 percent of vocational students were in the military 18 months after high school.* *28 percent of vocational students were employed 18 months after graduating from high school.*	3.2 High School and Beyond, 4th Follow-up, 1992, (draft pub., Voc. Ed. 2000, Table Figure 22.a). Follow-up 2000. State Performance Reports, annual, 2000. 1996 STW Transcript Study /Postsecondary follow-up. 1996 STW Transcript Study /Postsecondary follow-up.
Performance Standards and Measures			
4. Support state efforts to refine and expand performance measurement and accountability practices in vocational education for program improvement.	**4.1 Performance measurement.** An increasing proportion of states will use standards and measures for local program improvement	*In 1996, a Battelle study found 49% of states reporting results to secondary locals and 36% reporting to postsecondary locals.* *In 1998, current pilot effort with 7 states will increase to 20 states while the number of measures will increase from 2 to 6 by spring, 1999. Additional states will be included between 1999 and 2000.*	4.1 Batelle Accountability Study, 1998; State Annual Performance Reports, 1999. 4.2 Progress and Performance Measures Study, 1999.
School and Teacher Reform			
5. Determine that a sufficient number of vocational teachers are available for select occupational areas.	**5. Student-teacher ratio (STR).** The STR will remain relatively stable or decrease. Increases will indicate the need to work with states, teacher preparation institutions, and others to avoid teacher shortages.		5.1 State Annual Performance Reports, 2000. Supplemental data source for verification: School and Staffing Survey, 2000.

Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Act (State Grants and Tech-Prep Indicators)--$1,141,650,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: Increase access to and improve educational programs that strengthen education achievement, workforce preparation, and lifelong learning.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Funds provided to states through vocational education state grants support the six objectives outlined in our program plan. These objectives have been aligned with core measures identified in Perkins III, which states will use to promote continuous program improvement in academic achievement and job skills attainment, and to promote positive student outcomes at the state and local levels. State performance measures and GPRA program plan objectives are now aligned with the Department's Strategic Plan, objective 1.2, which states, "Every state has a school-to-work system that increases student achievement, improves technical skills, and broadens career opportunities for all."

Key Strategies

- Hold three technical assistance meetings with state staff on methods for improving student achievement, state and local accountability, and aligning vocational education curriculum with state academic standards.
- Support efforts by private sector, such as High Schools That Work, to help states integrate vocational and academic education and document effective practices.
- Support consortia of states in implementing challenging curriculum and assessments that are tied to state academic standards and industry-recognized standards in such areas as health, manufacturing, and high technology.
- Through focus groups, conferences, and site visits, work with State Data Collection Associations, the Accountability Committee of the National Association of State Directors, and other stakeholders to improve secondary and postsecondary data and accountability systems.
- Enhance data management systems to increases capacity for improved collection and analysis of state data.
- Cosponsor three workshops with National Center for Research in Vocational Education for states and other stakeholders to assist in the development of accountability systems that capture student achievement.
- Hold three technical assistance sessions for states to help them develop and use performance measurement systems, and use outcome measures common to STW and vocational education. Currently, OVAE has a contract for the development and use of uniform measures.
- Support the preparation and professional development of teachers to use contextual teaching and learning strategies to improve academic achievement through a $5.9 million contract.

National Programs (Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Act)--$17,500,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: Increase access to and improve educational programs that strengthen educational achievement, workforce preparation, and lifelong learning.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: All these objectives are designed to improve the quality, usefulness, and accessibility of projects funded by our National Programs budget. Projects have been prioritized according to program objectives and Objective 1.2 of the Department's Strategic Plan.

Objective	Indicator	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
Research			
1. Increase the use of research findings to inform program direction and to improve state and local practice.	1.1 **Promote quality research.** The percentage of consumers rating research and products of the National Center for Research in Vocational Education (NCRVE) as addressing important and relevant vocational education issues in a timely and quality fashion will increase from baseline data.		1.1 a. Annual consumer review; b. Quarterly and yearly progress reports detailing delivery of products.; c. Expert peer review & publication in refereed professional journals. Consumer review, annual, 1999; progress reports, quarterly and annual, 1999; expert peer review, 1999; review of citations in refereed professional journals, 1999.
2. Provide high quality data to support policy makers at federal, state and local levels.	2.1 **Program impacts.** By 2002, changes in the programs and strategies promoted through vocational education will provide students with access to strong academic and industry-recognized technical skills, broad career pathways, and transition to postsecondary education and employment.		2.1 a. State annual performance reports; b. NCES – Industry-based skill standards survey (1999) and follow-up;. c. National Assessment of Vocational Education (NAVE, 2002); d. NCRVE Tech Prep study (1999/2000); NCRVE Support-to-States initiative (1999); e. Career Clusters in 6 broad industry areas.
School Reform			
3. Improve and expand the use of effective strategies that promote secondary and postsecondary reforms.	3.1 **New American High Schools**. By fall 2001, 200 high schools will have fully adopted all NAHS reform elements; 2,000 high schools will be participating in the NAHS initiative and will have developed implementation plans and begun restructuring based on the NAHS principles.	*In 1998, 17 schools fully involved; additional 40-50 schools currently in process.*	3.1 Evaluations undertaken by funded NAHS projects (third party); semiannual and annual project reports.; evaluation contract for NAHS project. (Established May 1999).
	3.2 **Professional development.** By 2000, at least 5 models of teacher development will be established to promote the recruitment, preparation, and professional development of teachers, emphasizing training in contextual teaching and learning.	*In fall 1998, 7 contracts were awarded to develop models that prepare new teachers, strengthen current teachers and recruit new teachers.*	3.2 Case studies (spring 1999); interim project reports; initial models established by March 2000.

National Programs (Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Act)--$17,500,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: Increase access to and improve educational programs that strengthen educational achievement, workforce preparation, and lifelong learning.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: All these objectives are designed to improve the quality, usefulness, and accessibility of projects funded by our National Programs budget. Projects have been prioritized according to program objectives and Objective 1.2 of the Department's Strategic Plan.

Objective	Indicator	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
	3.3 **Career clusters.** By fall 2001, standards-based curriculum and portable skill certificates, developed by industry-education partnerships, will be available in 6 broad industry areas.	*In 1997, pilot clusters in 3 areas, Health, Manufacturing and Business, were developed. In 1999 clusters in an additional 3 areas will be developed (A/V & Communications, IT, and Transportation).*	3.3 Building Linkages study (April 1999. Evaluation of program effectiveness, 2000-01).

Key Strategies

- Customer/end-user advisory groups will provide input; customer surveys will measure utility and relevance.
- Use DNP Research Team, Cooperative Agreement, and technology to ensure that timetables are established and met, and to track products/studies.
- Make computer searches of publication databases, and reprint published studies.
- Papers have been commissioned in preparation for the NAVE.
- The progress of the NAVE is being monitored to ensure timely completion of milestones.
- NCRVE research and technical assistance for Tech Prep programs and state program accountability systems.
- Prepare case studies of changes in higher education and teacher preparation strategies.
- Pre-service programs to prepare teachers to use contextual teaching and learning strategies are being developed.
- A consortia of stakeholders will develop and disseminate career clusters in at least 6 areas, with career-related curricula, incorporating industry and state standards, and providing skill certificates in high- demand occupations that are portable across industries and states.

Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Vocational Institutions—$4,100,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To increase access to and improve vocational education that will strengthen workforce preparation, employment opportunities, and lifelong learning in the Indian Community.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Program objectives relate to the Department's objective 1.2, which states, "Every state has a school-to-work system that increases student achievement, improves technical skills, and broadens opportunities for all."

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
Student achievement and participation			
1. Ensure that Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Vocational Institutions provide increased access to vocational-technical education programs for historically under-served targeted populations.	1.1 **Increased student participation.** By the year 2000 the number of vocational students seeking certificates or AA degrees in vocational training areas will increase.		1.1 Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Vocational Institutions Performance Reports, annual, 1999.
	1.2 **Increased participation in articulated programs.** By the year 2000 the number of vocational students participating in associate degree training programs that are articulated with an advanced degree option will increase.		1.2 Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Vocational Institutions Performance Reports, annual, 1999.
2. Ensure that vocational students served in Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Vocational Institutions make successful transitions to work or continuing education.	2.1 **Postsecondary outcomes.** By the year 2000 the number of vocational students attaining employment in the field in which they were trained or pursuing higher level training at the certificate or BA level will increase.		2.1 Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Vocational Institutions Performance Reports, annual, 1999.

Key Strategies

- Work with the Office of the White House Initiative for Tribal Colleges and Universities to develop additional strategies.
- Work with grantees to improve the collection of placement data.
- Encourage grantees to include apprenticeship and work-based learning opportunities in their institutions.
- Work with grantees to encourage coordination of associate degree programs with 4-year institutions through articulation agreements.

Adult Education: State Grants and Knowledge Development—$569,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: **To support adult education systems that result in increased adult learner achievement in order to prepare adults for family, work, citizenship, and future learning.**

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: The primary linkage is with Goal 3 of the Department's Strategic Plan (Ensure access to postsecondary education and lifelong learning). The adult education objectives are focused on increasing access to and improving the overall quality of adult education and literacy services nationwide. To support the overall goal, the adult education objectives target a variety of program improvement initiatives in the areas of instruction, teacher training, use of technology, research, and program accountability. In addition, strategies related to family literacy – such as the development of a family literacy distance learning project – are being implemented in support of Goal 2 (Build a solid foundation for learning of all children). Also objective 7 supports the goal of making ED a high-performance organization by focusing on results, service quality, and customer satisfaction.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
Adult learners			
1. Improve literacy in the United States.	1.1 **Improve literacy.** By 2002 the number of adults performing in the lowest proficiency level in the National Adult Literacy Survey (NALS) will decrease.	*Between 40 and 44 million adults are estimated to be in the lowest of five proficiency levels in the 1992 NALS.*	1.1 NALS I, 1992; Synthetic Estimates of National Literacy Levels, 1999; NALS II, 2002.
2. Provide adult learners with opportunities to acquire basic foundation skills (including English language acquisition), complete secondary education, and transition to further education and training and to work.	2.1 **Basic skill acquisition.** By 2000, 40% of adults in beginning-level Adult Basic Education (ABE) programs will complete that level and achieve basic skill proficiency.	*In 1996, 630,000 beginning level students had a 28% completion rate.*	2.1 Adult Education Management Information System/ annual, 1999.
	2.2 **Basic English language acquisition.** By 2002, 40% of adults in beginning English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) programs will complete and achieve basic English literacy.	*In 1996, 435,000 beginning ESOL students had 27% completion rate.*	2.2 Adult Education Management Information System/annual, 1999.
	2.3 **Secondary completion.** By 2000, 40% of adults enrolled in secondary level programs will earn a diploma or General Educational Development (GED) credential.	*In 1996, 928,000 secondary level students had a 38% attainment rate.*	2.3 Adult Education Management Information System/annual, 1999.
	2.4 **Transition to further education and training.** By 2000, 300,000 adults participating in adult education will enroll in further academic education and/or vocational training.	*In 1996, 175,000 adults in adult education enrolled in further education and training.*	2.4 Adult Education Management Information System/annual, 1999.
	2.5 **Transition to work**. By 2000, 300,000 adults participating in adult education will get a job or retain or advance in their current job	*In 1996, 268,000 adults in adult education got a job, were retained in a job, or advanced on the job.*	2.5 Adult Education Management Information System/annual, 1999.
3. Provide adult learners at the lowest levels of literacy access to educational opportunities to improve their basic foundation skills.	3.1 **Educationally disadvantaged.** By 2000, adults at the lowest levels of literacy (those in Beginning ABE and Beginning ESOL) will comprise 45-50% of the total national enrollment.	*In 1996, adult enrollments at the lowest levels of literacy represented 42% of total enrollment.*	3.1 Adult Education Management Information System, annual, 1999.

Adult Education: State Grants and Knowledge Development—$569,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To support adult education systems that result in increased adult learner achievement in order to prepare adults for family, work, citizenship, and future learning.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: The primary linkage is with Goal 3 of the Department's Strategic Plan (Ensure access to postsecondary education and lifelong learning). The adult education objectives are focused on increasing access to and improving the overall quality of adult education and literacy services nationwide. To support the overall goal, the adult education objectives target a variety of program improvement initiatives in the areas of instruction, teacher training, use of technology, research, and program accountability. In addition, strategies related to family literacy – such as the development of a family literacy distance learning project – are being implemented in support of Goal 2 (Build a solid foundation for learning of all children). Also objective 7 supports the goal of making ED a high-performance organization by focusing on results service quality, and customer satisfaction.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
	3.2 **Distance learning**. By 2000, 15 states will offer ESOL instruction through the Crossroads Café distance learning program	*In 1996, 5 states offered ESOL instruction through Crossroads Café.*	3.2 Adult Education Management Information System, annual, 1999. *New data elements required.*
State and local programs			
4. Implement state and local performance management systems for accountability and program improvement.	4.1 **Building performance management capacity.** By 2000, all states will implement a national results-based performance management system to report on program effectiveness and learner achievement.	*The system will be available for implementation in PY 2000.*	4.1 Adult Education Management Information System, annual, 2001. *Will require modification and expansion to accommodate new result measures and benchmarks.*
Professional development and teacher training			
5. States will implement statewide professional development systems and professional standards for instructors.	5.1 **High teaching standards.** By 2000, at least 13 states will adopt professional standards for adult education teachers.	*In 1996, 10 states had professional standards for adult education teachers.*	5.1 Adult Education Management Information System, 1999. *Minor revisions to system needed*
	5.2 **System-wide Professional Development.** By 2000, between 20 and 25 states will implement Statewide professional development systems.	*In 1996, 15 states had Implemented statewide Professional development Systems.*	5.2 Adult Education Management Information System, 1999. *Minor revisions to system needed.*
Systems building			
6. Improve access to and the quality of programs for adult learners by integrating services and leveraging resources.	6.1 **Family literacy.** By 2000, adult education programs in 20 states will be formal partners with Even Start and Head Start agencies in the delivery of family literacy programs.	*In 1996, 7 states reported formal Partnerships between Education and Even Start Programs.*	6.1 Adult Education Management Information System, 1999 *Requires system revision.*
	6.2 **Employment and training.** By 2000, at least 13 states will implement statewide policy supporting the development of workforce/workplace programs.	*In 1996, 5 states had policies Supporting workforce/workplace Programs.*	6.2 Adult Education Management Information System, 1999.

Adult Education: State Grants and Knowledge Development—$569,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To support adult education systems that result in increased adult learner achievement in order to prepare adults for family, work, citizenship, and future learning.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: The primary linkage is with Goal 3 of the Department's Strategic Plan (Ensure access to postsecondary education and lifelong learning). The adult education objectives are focused on increasing access to and improving the overall quality of adult education and literacy services nationwide. To support the overall goal, the adult education objectives target a variety of program improvement initiatives in the areas of instruction, teacher training, use of technology, research, and program accountability. In addition, strategies related to family literacy – such as the development of a family literacy distance learning project – are being implemented in support of Goal 2 (Build a solid foundation for learning of all children). Also objective 7 supports the goal of making ED a high-performance organization by focusing on results, service quality, and customer satisfaction.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
Improved Practice			
7. **Improve and expand knowledge base of strategies that support reform in adult education.**	7.1 **Customer Satisfaction.** External peer reviews/customer satisfaction surveys show increasing satisfaction with the quality of research, development, and program improvement activities		7.1 Stakeholder Survey, 1999.

Key Strategies

- Target the $103 million increase for Adult Education State Grants to help states enhance the capacity of adult education programs to improve learner retention and achievement, particularly for Hispanics and other limited English proficient adults.
- Develop and pilot test a reporting system that meets the performance accountability requirements for the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act.
- Implement a long-term technology initiative to extend access to adult education and literacy services to adult learners within their homes, workplaces, and communities; make high-quality instruction available through a variety of modalities, including distance learning; and increase access to staff development through the expanded use of technology.
- Continue studies of "what works" in adult basic education and English as a second language programs to improve the quality of services.
- Support the development of public/private collaborative projects, such as a technology-based distance learning family literacy project, that increase access to adult education services in rural localities.
- Support a multi-year project in one-stop employment centers to demonstrate model student assessments to screen adults for learning disabilities.
- Provide technical assistance to states on best practices and models for integrating pre-employment and work readiness activities in basic skills programs.
- Collaborate with states to develop model professional teaching standards and provide technical assistance in system improvement.
- Continue collaborative partnership with the National Center for Family Literacy and Even Start to develop state-level alliances that support coordinated family literacy services.

National Institute for Literacy--$6,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To provide the adult education and literacy field with the knowledge, resources, and infrastructure necessary to improve the quality of literacy instruction and the achievement of learners.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Program objectives are in support of Strategic plan objective 3.4, which is to ensure that all adults can strengthen their skills and improve their earnings power over their lifetime through lifelong learning.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
Technology and Literacy Initiative (LINCS)			
1. **Provide literacy instructors, students, and administrators with an Internet-based, state-of-the-art information and communication system -- the Literacy Information and Communication System (LINCS) -- that improves the quality and increases the availability of literacy services.**	1.1 **Improving quality**. LINCS' users will judge its information and communications resources useful in improving the quality and availability of literacy services. 1.2 **Expanding use of technology**. The number of instructors trained to use LINCS will increase by 20% over the baseline each year. 1.3 **Technology in the classroom**. Of those trained through LINCS, 40% will report an expanded use of technology and improvement in the quality of instruction.	*The number trained in 1997-98 is 4,900.*	1.1 On-line surveys of LINCS users, including listserv subscribers, ongoing, 1999. 1.2 Enrollment data at LINCS training, 1999. 1.3 Follow-up surveys of instructors trained to use LINCS, semi-annual, 1999
Improving Instruction for Adults with Learning Disabilities			
2. **Improve the quality of instruction for adults with learning disabilities, especially in the area of reading.**	2.1 **Improving instruction for learning disabled adults**. 70% of individuals trained in the use of *Bridges to Practice,* a set of guidebooks for identifying and serving adults with LD, will report satisfaction with it as a means of improving services and the quality of instruction for LD adults.		2.1 Survey of training participants, 1999.
	2.2 **Training teachers for better reading instruction**. The number of teachers trained to use a research-based reading approach will increase annually.		2.2 Data from pilot programs using these research-based reading approaches and subsequent surveys on the extent of use of the approaches, 2000.
	2.3 **Improving reading instruction.** Teachers trained to use the approach for teaching reading developed through this project will be more effective than those using alternative approaches.		2.3 Data from pilot programs using the reading model and subsequent surveys on the extent of use of the model, 2000.

National Institute for Literacy--$6,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: **To provide the adult education and literacy field with the knowledge, resources, and infrastructure necessary to improve the quality of literacy instruction and the achievement of learners.**

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Program objectives are in support of Strategic plan objective 3.4, which is to ensure that all adults can strengthen their skills and improve their earnings power over their lifetime through lifelong learning.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
System Reform Project (Equipped for the Future)			
3. Equipped for the Future System Reform Project. Develop content standards, performance standards, and assessments that will improve literacy abilities in a broad array of skill areas	3.1 **Expanding the number of teachers trained to use the EFF standards.** The number of teachers trained to use EFF will increase by 10% over the baseline each year.		3.1 Data on Certificates awarded for successful completion of EFF training, annual, 2000.
	3.2 **Improving instruction of adult learners** 70% of teachers and tutors who have received at least 12 hours of training in using the Equipped for the Future framework and standards will report satisfaction with them as a means of providing more effective instruction to adults who come to their programs.		3.2 Follow-up surveys of instructors trained to use EFF, annual, 2000.
4. Increase awareness of the availability of literacy services and the need for public and private support for literacy efforts.	4.1 **Recruitment and program support.** The number of individuals recruited into literacy programs and the amount of support (including volunteers) for literacy services will increase 5% nationally and 20% in 10 targeted cities.	*National baseline is 5,640. Local baselines to be determined once 10 cities are identified.*	4.1 Reports from the NIFL Literacy Hotline, a sampling of follow-up calls to programs where individuals are referred, and reports from 10 participating cities, ongoing, 1999.

Key Strategies

- ❖ Continue to build a high quality database of materials and communications opportunities that directly and indirectly support the improvement and growth of literacy services in the nation. Provide training to individuals at the state and local program level.
- ❖ Use recent research on reading instruction to develop and test a model of effective reading instruction for adults that can be incorporated into literacy programs nationwide.
- ❖ Link ongoing effort to improve instruction for adults with learning disabilities with a new reading project to begin in the summer of 1999.
- ❖ Fund state and local literacy professionals and work with commercial publishers to create materials and assessments that lead to achievement of EFF standards. Support pilot program sites in using and assessing EFF products.
- ❖ Create public awareness opportunities in the media and through other mechanisms that increase awareness about the availability of literacy services and the need for increased support.

State Grants for Incarcerated Youth Offenders--$12,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To increase access to and achievement in correctional education programs that will aid in the reintegration of prisoners into their communities.

Relation of Program Goal to Strategic Plan: The activities of the State Grants for Incarcerated Youth Offenders program support objectives 3.4 (lifelong learning) and 2.4 (special populations receive appropriate services).

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
Student Achievement			
1. Grantees will develop and implement improved educational programs that include postsecondary education and vocational training.	1.1 **Improved completion rates**. By 2000 the rate of students completing educational programs within adult prisons and pre-release facilities will increase.	*The Department first awarded grants in 1998. Baseline data from the annual evaluation reports will not be available until fall 1999.*	1.1 Evaluation reports, annual, 1999.
	1.2 **Improved academic and vocational achievement**. By 2000 student achievement scores on testing measures will improve and the number of students obtaining vocational skill certificates will increase.		1.2 Evaluation reports, annual, 1999.
	1.3 **Improved recidivism rates**. By 2000 recidivism rates for participants will be lower than those of the comparison groups.		1.3 Evaluation reports, annual, 1999.
Access to Services			
2. Improve access to postsecondary education and job placement programs for incarcerated persons.	2.1 **Increased participation in job placement programs and improved job retention rates.** By 2000, the rate of students obtaining jobs and retaining jobs will be higher than those of comparison groups.		2.1 Evaluation reports, annual, 1999.
	2.2 **Improved access to information on postsecondary education programs and job placement programs.** External peer reviews/customer satisfaction surveys of OCE technical support and mail response will show increasing satisfaction with quality of information provided.		2.2 Grantee feedback from technical support meetings, telephone and mail correspondence and site visits, ongoing, 1999.

Key Strategies

- ❖ Facilitate the exchange of information between grantees by establishing a network for the communication of effective strategies and best practices.
- ❖ Through technical assistance activities, work with grantees to improve data collection and begin to compile base line information on participants and completion rates.
- ❖ Encourage grantees to provide participants with information on postsecondary education and job placement programs specific to their regions.
- ❖ Work with grantees to determine the current available information concerning postsecondary education and job placement opportunities either during incarceration or post release and work to provide any additional information.
- ❖ The Office of Correctional Education (OCE) will continue to coordinate Department-wide correctional education activities through its coordinating committee on correctional education.

Student Financial Assistance

Student Financial Assistance Programs--$9,183,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: **To help ensure access to high-quality postsecondary education by providing financial aid in the form of grants, loans, and work-study in an efficient, financially sound, and customer-responsive manner.**

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Supports Objective 3.2 by efficiently providing student financial aid to help enable low-income students to enroll in and complete postsecondary education.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
End Outcomes			
1. **Ensure that low- and middle-income students will have the same access to postsecondary education that high-income students do.**	1.1 **Percent of unmet need.** Considering all sources of financial aid, the percent of unmet need, especially for low-income students, will show continuous decreases over time	*In 1995-96, average unmet need for all students was 22.5%, ranging from 53.5% for independent students with incomes less than $5,000 to 4% for independent students with incomes of $30,000 or more.*	1.1 National Postsecondary Student Aid Study (NPSAS), 2001. *Note: Efforts are under way to estimate yearly changes in the variables that make up unmet need.*
	1.2 **College enrollment rates.** Postsecondary education enrollment rates will increase each year for all students, while the enrollment gap between low- and high-income and minority and non-minority high school graduates will decrease each year.	*In 1997, there was a 25.2% gap (57% vs.82.2%) between low- and high-income high school graduates aged 16-24 enrolling immediately in college.*	1.2 Current Population Statistics (CPS), annual, 1999.
	1.3 **Targeting of Pell Grants.** Pell Grant funds will continue to be targeted to those students with the greatest financial need: at least 75% of Pell Grant funds will go to students below 150% of poverty level.	*Currently, 76% of Pell Grant funds do so.*	1.3 Program data, annual, 1999.
	1.4 **Debt burden.** The percentage of students with student loan debt repayments exceeding 10% of their gross income will remain stable or decline over time.	*Among 1992-1993 bachelors degree recipients making loan payments, 29% had required payments that were more than10% of their gross income. (Analysis of 1994 Baccalaureate and Beyond Study*	1.4 Baccalaureate and Beyond Study, 2001. *Note: Efforts are underway to develop an annual measure of debt burden, using data from the Social Security Administration.*
2. **Ensure that more students will persist in postsecondary education and attain degrees and certificates.**	2.1 **Completion rate.** Completion rates for all full-time, eligible, degree-seeking students in 4-year and 2-year colleges will improve, while the gap in completion rates between low- and high-income and minority and non-minority students will decrease.	*BPS data indicate a gap of approximately 23% in 4-year college completion within 5 years between low- and high-income students. For students entering 4-year colleges in 1990, the percentage who had completed by 1994, is as follows:* *Highest income quartile: 57.2%* *Second income quartile: 47.4%* *Third income quartile: 40.4%* *Lowest income quartile: 34.4%*	2.1 Beginning Postsecondary Students (BPS) Survey (completion rates), 2001. *Note: Beginning in 1999 completion rates will be available annually from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System.*

Student Financial Assistance Programs--$9,183,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To help ensure access to high-quality postsecondary education by providing financial aid in the form of grants, loans, and work-study in an efficient, financially sound, and customer-responsive manner.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Supports Objective 3.2 by efficiently providing student financial aid to help enable low-income students to enroll in and complete postsecondary education.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
3. Ensure that taxpayers will have a positive return on investment in the federal student financial assistance programs.	3.1 **Employment rate.** Title IV recipients will maintain employment at rates at least equal to the rate for non-recipients. 3.2 **Return on investment.** The benefits of the student aid programs, in terms of increased tax revenues, will continue to exceed their costs..	*BPS data suggest that employment rates of Title IV recipients and non-recipients are equal for both graduates and non-graduates.* *A Department study found that for every dollar spent on student aid in 1996, almost $3 was returned to the treasury in terms of increased tax revenues and decreased welfare costs. The return for students receiving a Bachelor's Degree was almost $4 for every $1 invested in student aid.*	3.1 BPS, 1998 and Baccalaureate and Beyond (B&B), 2001 3.2 Analysis of Census data by Office of the Under Secretary's Planning and Evaluation Service (PES), annual, 1999.
4. Encourage postsecondary students to engage in community service.	4.1 **Community Service.** The percent of Federal Work-Study program funds spent on community service will equal or exceed the current percent, especially for America Reads.	*In 1996-97, approximately 11% of Federal Work-Study program funds were spent on community service.*	4.1 OPE program data, annual, 1999.

Operations (Interim plan, final to be submitted in September 1999)

On December 8, 1998, a Performance-based Organization (PBO) was created to help modernize and improve the student aid delivery system. The PBO is in the process of developing a performance plan for the succeeding 5 years, as required in the Higher Education Act, that establishes measurable goals and objectives for the organization. The 5-year performance plan will be submitted to Congress in September 1999 after extensive consultation with all interested parties. In the interim, the following set of indicators has been developed to describe the specific actions the PBO will take in the next 7 months to ensure the continued efficient operation of the student aid delivery system and to set the stage for future modernization and improvement.

Student Financial Assistance Programs--$9,183,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To help ensure access to high-quality postsecondary education by providing financial aid in the form of grants, loans, and work-study in an efficient, financially sound, and customer-responsive manner.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Supports Objective 3.2 by efficiently providing student financial aid to help enable low-income students to enroll in and complete postsecondary education.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
5. To improve customer satisfaction.	5.1 **RFMS system.** Put the new Recipient Fund Management System in place by 8/30/99 and ensure that users do not experience any degradation in service.	*Not applicable.*	5.1 Not applicable.
	5.2 **FAFSA applications.** Process Free Application For Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) applications within an average turnaround time of eight days or less (through 9/30/99).	*Current benchmark is 8 days.*	5.2 Program data, weekly, 1999.
	5.3 **Direct Loan disbursements.** Enable qualified Direct Loan schools to disburse money to qualified students while they wait (by 9/30/99).	*Not applicable.*	5.3 Not applicable.
	5.4 **Consolidation processing.** Continue to process completed Direct Loan Consolidation applications within an average turnaround time of 60 days or less (From 1/1/99 - 9/30/99)	*Current benchmark is 54 days.*	5.4 Program data, weekly, 1999.
	5.5 **Processing.** Process all transactions with schools so that disruptions for students and schools are minimal (through 9/30/99).	*Benchmarks:* ❖ *After implementing RFMS, make Pell funds available to school within 36 hours of submission.* ❖ *Process all audits within six months.* ❖ *Complete reimbursement requests within 30 days.* ❖ *Respond to student complaints within 10 days.* ❖ *IPOS completes all transactions within established timeframes 95% of the time.*	5.5 Program data, 1999.
	5.6 **Y2K conversions.** Complete, validate and put in use all Y2K systems conversions (by 3/31/99).	*10 of 11 systems Y2K compliant, the last system conversion will be successfully completed by mid-March, 1999.*	5.6 Not applicable.
	5.7 **Customer preferences.** Establish a program to collect customer preferences and our performance on an on-going basis (by 9/30/99).	*Not applicable.*	5.7 Not applicable.

Student Financial Assistance Programs–$9,183,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To help ensure access to high-quality postsecondary education by providing financial aid in the form of grants, loans, and work-study in an efficient, financially sound, and customer-responsive manner.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Supports Objective 3.2 by efficiently providing student financial aid to help enable low-income students to enroll in and complete postsecondary education.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
	5.8 **Electronic applications.** Attract three million new electronic filings from aid applicants for the twelve-month period ending 9/30/1999.	*Currently, we anticipate receiving over 2.6 million electronic FAFSA applications by 9/30/99; additional volume will come from borrowers electronically submitting their loan consolidation applications and schools submitting their eligibility applications. Three million is equal to approximately one-third of the annual volume of aid applications, an ambitious target originally established for the 2000-2001 award year.*	5.8 Program data, weekly, 1999.
	5.9 **Service experiences**. Create five new positive experiences in services delivered to our customers and partners (by 9/30/99).	*Not applicable*	5.9 Not applicable.
	5.10 **New products.** Introduce five new electronic products and services - at least as pilots – which move us toward the EASI vision (by 9/30/99).	*Not applicable*	5.10 Not applicable.
6. Reduce the overall cost of delivering student aid.	6.1 **Cost baseline.** Establish a baseline estimate of the overall costs of delivering student aid (by 9/30/99).	*Not applicable.*	6.1 Not applicable.
	6.2 **Cost reduction.** Create a core measure or measures for judging cost reduction performance (e.g. total delivery dollars spent per assistance dollar outstanding by 9/30/99).	*Not applicable.*	6.2 Not applicable.
	6.3 **Financial management system.** Design a complete, subsidiary-style financial management system for the PBO (by 9/30/99).	*Not applicable.*	6.3 Not applicable.
	6.4 **Audits.** Provide all necessary support needed to achieve clean audits for FY 98 and FY 99, with FY 99 documentation delivered on time to support a March 2000 publication date.	*Not applicable.*	6.4 Not applicable.

Student Financial Assistance Programs--$9,183,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To help ensure access to high-quality postsecondary education by providing financial aid in the form of grants, loans, and work-study in an efficient, financially sound, and customer-responsive manner.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Supports Objective 3.2 by efficiently providing student financial aid to help enable low-income students to enroll in and complete postsecondary education.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
	6.5 **Default recovery rate.** Maintain default recovery rate at ten percent or more of prior year-end outstanding balances (through 9/30/99).	*Current benchmark is 10% reflecting the FY98 rate.*	6.5 Program data, annual, 1999.
	6.6 **Cohort default rate.** Maintain cohort default rate at ten percent or less (through 9/30/99).	*Current benchmark is 9.6% reflecting the FY 96 rate.*	6.6 Program data, annual, 1999.
	6.7 **Performance based contracts.** Use performance based contracts in all major new contract awards (through 9/30/99).	*Not applicable.*	6.7 Not applicable.
	6.8 **Current contracts.** Extend current contracts, where that is necessary, early enough to avoid cost impacts (through 9/30/99).	*Not applicable.*	6.8 Not applicable.
	6.9 **Identify cost cutting actions.** Review PBO operations to identify cost cutting actions in delivering student aid (by 4/1/99).	*Not applicable.*	6.9 Not applicable.
	6.10**Incentives.** Develop incentives to encourage high performance by partners.	*Not applicable.*	6.10 Not applicable.
7. **Transform the Student Financial Assistance Office into a performance-based organization.**	7.1 **Collaboration with partners.** Conduct collaborative working sessions with partners – schools and the financial community – on how to improve services to students and cut overall program costs (by 4/30/99, feed ideas to the customer service task force). These collaborative working sessions are an essential part of the drive to identify the improvements most desired by our customers and partners.	*Not applicable.*	7.1 Not applicable.
	7.2 **Benchmarks.** Find best in the business organizations that we can use to benchmark our processes, systems and people (make initial comparisons by 7/31/99).	*Not applicable.*	7.2 Not applicable.

272

273

Student Financial Assistance Programs--$9,183,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To help ensure access to high-quality postsecondary education by providing financial aid in the form of grants, loans, and work-study in an efficient, financially sound, and customer-responsive manner.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Supports Objective 3.2 by efficiently providing student financial aid to help enable low-income students to enroll in and complete postsecondary education.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
	7.3 **Customer service improvements.** Deliver a task force report on how to make specific, top to bottom improvements in customer service and satisfaction (by 7/1/99).	*Not applicable.*	7.3 .Not applicable.
	7.4 **Systems architecture.** Complete a systems architecture and acquisition strategy for all-major PBO business processes and computer systems, to support our improved service and cost management objectives (by 7/31/99).	*Not applicable.*	7.4 Not applicable.
	7.5 **Budget plan**. Deliver a preliminary budget plan for the PBO by 4/1/99, (we will seek congressional concurrence at a later date for a comprehensive plan in order to use results from the customer service task force and architecture projects).	*Not applicable.*	7.5 Not applicable.
	7.6 **Organizational plan.** With employees, develop a human resources and organizational plan for the PBO (by 9/30/99).	*Not applicable.*	7.6 Not applicable.
	7.7 **Employee satisfaction.** With employees, develop a system to measure employee satisfaction (by 9/30/99).	*Not applicable.*	7.7 Not applicable.
	7.8 **Performance plan.** Deliver the five-year performance plan for the PBO, including recommendations for additional legislation to improve service and reduce cost (by 9/30/99).	*Not applicable.*	7.8 Not applicable.
	7.9 **Ombudsman.** Hire an Ombudsman and build a complaint "cherishing" system (by 9/30/99). This function is required of the PBO under HEA reauthorization.	*Not applicable.*	7.9 Not applicable.

Student Financial Assistance Programs--$9,183,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To help ensure access to high-quality postsecondary education by providing financial aid in the form of grants, loans, and work-study in an efficient, financially sound, and customer responsive manner.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Supports Objective 3.2 by efficiently providing student financial aid to help enable low-income students to enroll in and complete postsecondary education.

Key Strategies

- **Student financial assistance**. If enacted, the Department's FY 2000 budget would provide more than $52 billion in grant, loan, and work-study assistance to 8.8 million postsecondary students. A $7.5 billion request for Pell Grants would increase the maximum award by $125 to $3,250, the highest ever, and provide grants to nearly 3.9 million students. A $934 million request for Work-Study (an increase of $64 million) would allow approximately 1 million students work their way through college. Modifying the allocation formula for the three campus-based aid programs (Work-Study, Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants, and Perkins Loans) would gradually distribute a larger share of appropriated funds on the basis of institutional need. The Federal Family Education Loans and Federal Direct Student Loan programs would support 9.5 million loans to postsecondary students totaling an estimated $41.2 billion.
- **Support services for postsecondary students.** Besides providing financial assistance to help students enroll in and complete postsecondary education, the Department also supports programs that provide students with the non-financial services needed to achieve their educational objectives. The $630 million request for TRIO would enhance the Student Support Services and McNair programs, which are designed to encourage individuals from disadvantaged backgrounds to complete college and pursue graduate studies. The new College Completion Challenge Grants program would provide $35 million to help institutions of higher education increase the persistence rate of students who are at risk of dropping out of college. Redesigning performance reports and disseminating information regarding effective practices would improve the provision of support services to students.
- **Improve the quality of postsecondary education.** While most of the Department's efforts support the direct provision of assistance to students, whether it is financial or non-financial, the Department also plays a significant role in helping to improve the quality of postsecondary education. The FY 2000 request of $521 million (a $41 million increase over FY 1999) requested for the Aid for Institutional Development, Developing Hispanic-Serving Institutions, and Howard University programs will help enable institutions serving high percentages of minority and disadvantaged students to provide these students a high quality postsecondary education. In addition, continued efforts will be made to promote sharing of "best practices" among institutions. The $27.5 million requested for the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) will enable the Department to continue to promote successful postsecondary education reform efforts. Priorities for FY 2000 funding will be grants aimed at helping to control the cost of postsecondary education and at enhancing dissemination activities. A doubling of funding (from $10 million to $20 million) for the recently created Learning Anywhere Anytime Partnership program will continue to encourage the development of innovative techniques to enhance the delivery of high quality postsecondary education and lifelong learning opportunities for all citizens, in all settings.
- **Modernize and improve the delivery system for the Student Financial Assistance programs.** As described above, the newly formed PBO has identified three key objectives—improve customer satisfaction, reduce the overall cost of delivering student aid, and transform the student financial assistance office into a performance-based organization—that will guide its work through September 1999 when a five-year performance plan will be submitted to Congress.

Higher Education

Aid for Institutional Development, Title III (HEA)--$259,825,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: **To assist institutions that have limited resources and that traditionally served large numbers of low-income and minority students to continue to serve these students, and to improve the capacity of these institutions to provide on-going, up-to-date quality education in all areas of higher education.**

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Title III supports the Department's overall goal of ensuring access and equity and enabling all students to achieve academic excellence. Title III serves large numbers of low-income and minority students for whom access, retention, and degree attainment have been elusive. Title III supports strategic plan Objectives 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, and 3.4.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
Program improvement objectives			
Title III – Part A (Strengthening Institutions), Part A, sec.316 (American Indian Tribally Controlled Colleges and Universities), Part A, sec.317 (Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian Serving Institutions), Part B (HBCUs and HBGIs), Part D (HBCU Capital Financing), Part E (Minority Science and Engineering Improvement Program)			
1. **Improve the academic quality of participating institutions.**	1.1 **Faculty development.** The number and percent of faculty participating in Title III-funded development activities will increase over time.	*In FY 1996, 43% of faculty at more than half of the institutions participated in faculty development.*	1.1 Performance reports – annual; initial comprehensive development plan (CDP); recognition awards; updated comprehensive development plans; 1999.
	1.2 **Access to technology.** The number and percentage of students gaining access to computers and the Internet due to Title III-funded activities will increase over time.	*In 1996, approximately 34% of students had computer and internet access.*	1.2 Performance reports – annual; initial comprehensive development plan; updated CDP; 1999
2. **Improve the fiscal stability of participating institutions.**	2.1 **Development offices.** The number and percent of development offices using grant funds to increase revenues will increase over prior years.	*In FY 1996, approximately 39% of institutions used grant funds to improve development offices.*	2.1 Performance reports – annual; initial comprehensive development plan; updated CDP; 1999.
	2.2 **Fiscal balances.** The fiscal balance of Title III-funded institutions will continue to remain positive over time.	*In FY 1996, more than 90% of institutions had positive fiscal balances.*	2.2 Performance reports – annual; initial comprehensive development plan; updated CDP; 1999.
3. **Improve the access of low-income and minority students to Title III-funded institutions.**	3.1 **Enrollment of low-income minority students.** The number and percent of low-income and minority students will remain stable or increase over time.	*In FY 1996, 38% of the students under Part A were minority and 86% under Part B were minority, compared with 20% for non-Title III institutions.* Under Part A, 51% of the students were low-income, under Part B 48% were low-income.	3.1 IPEDS; performance reports – annual; 1999.

Aid for Institutional Development, Title III (HEA)--$259,825,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To assist institutions that have limited resources and that traditionally served large numbers of low-income and minority students to continue to serve these students, and to improve the capacity of these institutions to provide on-going, up-to-date quality education in all areas of higher education.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Title III supports the Department's overall goal of ensuring access and equity and enabling all students to achieve academic excellence. Title III serves large numbers of low-income and minority students for whom access, retention, and degree attainment have been elusive. Title III supports strategic plan Objectives 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, and 3.4.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
	3.2 **Degree attainment.** The number and percentage of degrees awarded to minority students at Title III-funded institutions will remain stable or increase over time.	*In FY 1996, Part A institutions awarded 34% associate degrees and 38% bachelor's degrees. Part B institutions awarded 72% associate degrees and 88% bachelor's degrees.*	3.2 IPEDS; annual performance reports; 1999.
	3.3 **Improved access to careers in science and engineering.** The number of MSIP pre-college and undergraduate participants entering and completing MSIP interventions will remain stable or increase over time.	*In FY 1997, more than 75% of MSIP pre-college participants entered and completed MSIP interventions. Approximately 20% of MSIP undergraduate students entered and completed science and engineering programs.*	3.3 Initial application; annual performance report; IPEDS; 1999.
4. **For Part B –HBCU Graduate Program: Strengthened graduate and professional education.**	4.1 **Minority under-representation.** The number and percentage of advanced degrees in majors in which African American students are underrepresented will remain stable or decrease over time.	*In FY 1997, 3,500 of the 5,177 students enrolled in 20 advanced degree fields were African American.*	4.1 Performance reports – annual; initial comprehensive development plans; annual updates; 1999.
5. **Improve physical plants through grant funding and low-cost capital for repair, renovation, construction or acquisition of capital projects.**	5.1 **Capital projects.** The number of capital projects constructed, renovated, etc., using HBCU Capital Financing funds will increase over time.	*In 1997, 45 inquiries and 1 loan were made, and 4 applications were received.*	5.1 Designated bonding authority updates- monthly; DBA annual report; program annual report; 1999.

Key Strategies

- ❖ Assist Title III institutions in serving low-income and minority students by disseminating information to institutions on effective practices.
- ❖ Establish a formal mechanism for exchange of information with Title III-related organizations and higher education agencies and associations.
- ❖ Conduct consistent, thorough reviews of performance reports with feedback to grantees.

Title V - (Hispanic Serving Institutions Program) (HEA)--$42,250,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: **To assist Hispanic institutions that have limited resources and that traditionally served large numbers of low income and Hispanic students to continue to serve these students, and to improve the capacity of these institutions to provide on-going, up-to-date quality education in all areas of higher education.**

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Title V supports the Department's overall goal of ensuring access and equity and enabling all students to achieve academic excellence. Title V serves large numbers of low-income and minority students for whom access, retention, and degree attainment have been elusive. Title V supports strategic plan objectives 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, and 3.4.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
Program improvement objectives			
1. Improve academic quality of participating institutions.	1.1 **Faculty development.** The number and percent of faculty participating in Title V-funded development activities will increase over time.	*In FY 1996, 41% of faculty at more than half of the institutions participated in faculty development.*	1.1 Performance reports – annual; initial comprehensive development plan (CDP); recognition awards; updated comprehensive development plans; 1999.
	1.2 **Access to Technology.** The number and percent of students gaining access to computers and the Internet due to Title V-funded activities will increase over time.	*In 1996, approximately 25% of students had computer and internet access.*	1.2 Performance reports – annual; initial comprehensive development plan; updated CDP; 1999
2. Improve fiscal stability of participating institutions.	2.1 **Development offices**. The number and percent of development offices using grant funds to increase revenues will increase over prior years over time.	*In FY 1996, less than one third of institutions used grant funds to improve development offices.*	2.2 Performance reports – annual; initial comprehensive development plan; updated CDP; 1999.
	2.2 **Fiscal balances.** The fiscal balance of Title V-funded institutions will continue to remain positive.	*In FY 1996, more than 90% of institutions had positive fiscal balances.*	2.3 Performance reports – annual; initial comprehensive development plan; updated CDP; 1999.
3. Improve access of low-income and minority students to Title V funded institutions.	3.1 **Enrollment of low-income minority students.** The number and percent of low-income and minority students will remain stable or increase.	*In FY 1996, 63% of the students under Title V (HSI) were minority compared with 20% for non-Title V institutions.* *Under Title V, 56% of the students were low- income.*	3.3 IPEDS; performance reports – annual; 1999.
	3.2 **Degree Attainment.** The number and percent of degrees awarded to minority students at Title V-funded institutions will remain stable or increase over time.	*In FY 1996 Title V (HSI) institutions awarded 17% associate degrees and 14% bachelor degrees.*	3.2 IPEDS; annual performance reports; 1999
4. Improve physical plants with the use of grant funding.	4.1 **Improved physical plants**. The number of instructional improvements and renovations using Title V funding will increase over time.	*In FY 1996, less than 1% average total funding was spent on physical plants.*	Comprehensive development plans; annual performance reports; accreditation reports; IPEDS; 1999.

Title V - (Hispanic Serving Institutions Program) (HEA)--$42,250,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: **To assist institutions that have limited resources and that traditionally served large numbers of low income and minority students to continue to serve these students, and to improve the capacity of these institutions to provide on-going, up-to-date quality education in all areas of higher education.**

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Title V supports the Department's overall goal of ensuring access and equity and enabling all students to achieve academic excellence. Title V serves large numbers of low-income and minority students for whom access, retention, and degree attainment have been elusive. Title V supports strategic plan objectives 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, and 3.4.

Key Strategies

- Assist Title V institutions in serving low-income and minority students by disseminating information to institutions on effective practices and strategies in a variety of areas in higher education, such as persistence, academic skills development, endowment building, technology, expansion, special programming such as mathematics, science, graduate education, and opportunities for networking
- Establish a formal mechanism for exchange of information with Title V related organizations and higher education agencies and associations.
- Conduct consistent thorough reviews of performance reports with feedback to grantees.

International Education Programs--$69,022,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To meet the nation's security and economic needs through the development of a national capacity in foreign languages, area, and international studies.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Objective support strategic plan objectives 3.2 (…completion of high quality educational program), 4.1 (customer service) and 1.4 (talented teachers)

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
1. To develop specialists and an educated citizenry who can communicate in foreign languages, particularly in the less-commonly-taught languages, and who are knowledgeable about the countries in which those languages are spoken.	1.1 **Colleges Supported by Title VI Funds**. The percentage of colleges and universities offering less-commonly taught languages that are supported by Title VI funds.	*Title VI-supported institutions account for 22.5% of undergraduate and 59% of graduate enrollments in the Less Commonly Taught Languages (LCTLs). Title VI schools constitute 2.7% of all colleges and universities offering language instruction in the U.S. Among the Least Commonly Taught Languages (those with less than 1,000 students nationwide), Title VI-supported institutions account for 51% of undergraduate and 81% of graduate enrollments.*	1.1 "Language and National Security for the 21st Century: The Federal Role in Supporting National Language Capacity," National Foreign Language Center at Johns Hopkins University, 1999. Other data from performance reports, annual, 1999.
	1.2 **Number of PhD's teaching non-Western languages.** The number of persons receiving the Ph.D. under the Title VI/Fulbright-Hays funding who are teaching non-Western languages and area studies at U.S. colleges and universities.	*In 1995, DDRA fellows were teaching in at least 357 academic institutions in 48 states and the District of Columbia. During the first 33 years of the Fulbright-Hays Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad (DDRA) Program, more than 3200 fellowships were awarded to study in nearly one hundred different countries or geographic regions; nearly all fellows completed the Ph.D. More than 87% spent part of their professional careers teaching in colleges and universities. Over 50% of the DDRA fellows had been supported by Title VI fellowships for the initial (domestic) part of their graduate study.*	1.2 "Three Decades of Excellence: 1965 to 1994, The Fulbright-Hays Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad Fellowship Program and Its Impact on the American Academy," Council of American Overseas Research Centers, 1998. Other data from performance reports, annual, 1999.
2. Meet high level of customer satisfaction with the Title VI and Fulbright-Hays programs	2.1 **Timeliness of Awards**. The time from receipt of application to notification of award to grantee.	*Current time of seven months will be reduced to five months by the year 2000.*	2.1 Grant award schedule and award date, annual, 1999.

Key Strategies

- Set program priorities where relevant, and consult with international education constituency to encourage expanded coverage for under-represented areas and fields.
- Support through program funds advanced levels of uncommonly taught foreign languages; expand disciplinary offerings in world area and international studies
- Review and further streamline the grant award process so that awards for all programs can be made earlier in the funding cycle..

Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education--$27,500,000 (FY 2000)

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Supports objective 3.2 by helping to ensure the high quality of educational programs through reform and innovation.

Goal: To improve postsecondary education by making grants to institutions in support of reform and innovation.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
1. Promote reforms that improve the quality of teaching and learning at postsecondary institutions.	1.1 **Quality of postsecondary reforms; percentage of reforms.** The percentage of innovative educational reforms tested and implemented will increase.	*In 1988, 88% of completed FIPSE projects scored A, B, or C in overall quality, up from 84% in 1997. In 1998, as in 1997, 86% of projects reported, "The FIPSE project offered an opportunity for testing ideas that would not have been provided without FIPSE support."*	1.1 Final Report Score Card, annual, 1999; e-mail survey of FY 1990-1998 grantees, biannual, 2000.
	1.2 **Replication of projects.** The number of projects that are adapted in full or in part, or whose materials are used by other institutions, will increase over the number in previous years.	*In 1988, 94% of FIPSE grantees reported full or partial project replication. 27% report adaptations at 20 or more sites.*	1.2 Final Report Score Card, annual, 1999; Performance Report Score Card, annual, 1999; E-mail Survey of 1990-1999 grantees, biannual, 2000.
2. Increase participation and completion rates of students in postsecondary education.	2.1 **Student completion rate.** Participants in FIPSE persistence-related projects will complete postsecondary education at higher rates than previous years.	*In 1998, 35% of FIPSE projects reported larger numbers of students persisting or completing degrees. In 1997, this percentage was 48%.*	2.1 Final Report Score Card, annual, 1999.
3. Institutionalization of FIPSE programs.	3.1 **Projects sustained.** The number of projects sustained at least 2 years beyond federal funding will be maintained or increased beyond current level.	*This figure has increased from 70% in 1990 to 78%.in 1998. The 1998 e-mail survey shows 93% of responding projects have been sustained a full 6 years after the end of federal funding.*	3.1 E-mail survey of 1990-1999 grantees, biannual, 2000; Final Report Score Card, annual, 1999.
Management improvement objectives			
4. Improve service delivery and customer satisfaction for FIPSE programs.	4.1 **Project directors, overall satisfaction with FIPSE programs and services.** Satisfaction levels from previous year will be met or exceeded.	*In 1998 as in 1997, 98% of grantees reported that FIPSE staff provides full support. 93% rate the annual meeting as "good," very good" or "outstanding" (down from 97% in 1997).* 93% of 1998 *e-mail survey respondents reported quality of FIPSE staff support as "good," " very good," or "outstanding" (compared with 95% in 1997). 52% rated the staff support as "outstanding."*	4.1 Evaluation survey of annual meeting, 1998; project survey, annual, 1998; e-mail survey of 1990-1998 grantees, biannual, 2000; Final Report Score Card, annual, 1999.

290

291

Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education--$27,500,000 (FY 2000)

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Supports objective 3.2 by helping to ensure the high quality of educational programs through reform and innovation.

Goal: To improve postsecondary education by making grants to institutions in support of reform and innovation.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
	4.2 **Turnaround time.** The streamlined grant award process will reduce the time from receipt of application to the notification/award to grantees	*In 1998 9.5 months (compared to 10 months in 1997) for the Comprehensive Program, 3 months for International Programs (compared with 5 months in 1997).*	4.2 GCMS application log and grant award notification dates, annual performance report, 1999.
	4.3 **Novice applicant success rate**. Meet or exceed novice success level from previous year. (Novice means never-before-directed Federal grant)	*1997= 30% novices; 1998= 40% novices. Number of outreach seminars = 20 in 1997 and 68 in 1998.*	4.3 Project survey, annual, 1998; number of outreach seminars, 1998.
	4.4 **Overall satisfaction of applicants, successful and unsuccessful.** The levels from previous year will be met or exceeded..	*72% of all unsuccessful final proposal applicants requested and received technical assistance to improve their proposals.*	4.4 Number of feedback requests from applicants honored, 1998.

Key Strategies

- FIPSE will continue to support promising innovative strategies for increasing institutional performance and the quality of teaching.
- Access to higher education and program completion will be highlighted as major guideline priorities of the Comprehensive Project. FIPSE will continue to support innovative strategies for increasing program completion and disseminate successful programs nationally.
- FIPSE will support development and testing of new models of project adaptation and dissemination.
- FIPSE will continue to provide outreach seminars to under-served populations, full technical assistance to prospective grantees, and feedback to all unsuccessful applicants.

Urban Community Service Program–$0 (FY 2000)

Goal: **To facilitate the establishment of sustainable community service programs by using the resources of urban postsecondary institutions in partnership with communities to devise and implement solutions to pressing needs in their communities.**

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: This objective supports goal 4 in identifying effecting practices in education for use by customers and partners.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Sources, Periodicity, Next Update
1. **Develop effective communication networks among urban postsecondary institutions and communities.**	1.1 **Use of web site.** By Fall 1999, increase the number of users by publicizing the interactive Web site for use by other designated urban grant institutions, community-based organizations, cities, and foundations to promote linkages resulting in effective campus-community partnerships for community service.	*The web site is operational for current grantees and for less than one-half of the community partners.*	1.1 Supplemental grant request; performance report - annual, 1999.

Key Strategies

- ❖ Emphasize and disseminate information on factors that contribute to successful partnerships among postsecondary institutions, communities, and the public and private sectors.
- ❖ Review performance reports to assess progress toward meeting outcomes related to developing effective and sustainable partnerships identified in project proposal. Carefully examine efforts to achieve viable partnerships and disseminate.
- ❖ Publicize the web page and continue to develop it. Link (or move) the web page to ED's Web site and other related web pages.

294

295

Demonstration Projects to Ensure Students with Disabilities Receive a Quality Higher Education--$5,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To improve the quality of higher education for students with disabilities.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Supports Objective 3.2 (postsecondary students receive support for high-quality education) by providing grants to postsecondary institutions to aid in the development of model programs for ensuring that students with disabilities can receive a high-quality postsecondary education.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
1. Ensure that research and other information synthesized through grant activities is state of the art.	1.1 **State-of-the-art research.** Evaluation activities will show that 100 percent of the synthesized research and information disseminated through grant activities is state-of-the-art.	*New Program*	1.1 Program data, annual, 2000.
2. Ensure that faculty and administrators in institutions of higher education increase their capacity to provide a high-quality education to students with disabilities.	2.1 **Increased attendance.** The number of students with disabilities attending an institution benefiting from grants will increase each year beginning in 2001.	*New Program*	2.1 Performance reports, annual, 2000.
	2.2 **Increased degree attainment.** The number of students with disabilities completing coursework leading to a degree or attainment of a degree at an institution benefiting from grants will increase each year beginning in 2001.	*New Program*	2.2 Performance reports, annual, 2000.

Key Strategies

- Strictly evaluate award applications to ensure that only state-of-the-art-research and information are disseminated.
- Disseminate information on project outcomes to other institutions of higher education.

Annual Interest Subsidy Grants--$12,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To continue to help finance construction, reconstruction, or renovation of higher education facilities.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Supports Objective 3.2 (postsecondary students receive support for high-quality education) by providing the capital needed to renovate higher education facilities for schools unable to obtain private credit at reasonable rates.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
1. Continue to provide strong fiscal management of the program.	1.1 **Positive audit results.** There will be no material internal control weaknesses identified in program portion of Department's financial statement audit.	*No material internal control weaknesses were identified in the program portion of the Department's 1997 financial statement audits.*	1.1 Financial program audits, annual, 1998.

Key Strategies

- Changes have been made and internal controls tightened to significantly improve the overall fiscal reliability of the operating system. These include:
  - Verification of the status and terms of all underlying loans every 2 years. Half of the grants will be verified each year.
  - An information letter will be sent to all grantees yearly to remind them of their obligation to notify the Department of refinancing agreements or redemptions.
  - Control totals for the number of grants and the dollar amounts of each obligation for each fiscal year have been established and will be updated as needed.
  - To ensure the accuracy of the system, each year someone other than the grant manager will perform an independent reconciliation of the database and the control total spreadsheet.

TRIO Programs–$630,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: **To increase educational participation of disadvantaged students through effective management of the federal TRIO Programs.**

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Supports Objective 3.1 (secondary school students get college preparatory support) and Objective 3.2 (postsecondary students receive support for high quality education) by funding organizations to provide the necessary support services to enable disadvantaged students to purse postsecondary opportunities.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Sources, Periodicity, Next Update
Student outcomes			
1. **Increase participation and completion rates of disadvantaged persons in the academic pipeline in middle and high school that results in postsecondary enrollment.**	1.1–**Postsecondary enrollment**. Upward Bound participants will enroll in postsecondary education programs at rates higher than the national average and comparable non-participants.	*Preliminary evaluation findings show that Upward Bound has no effect on the likelihood that participants enroll in college, but increases college enrollment rates significantly for academically at-risk students (3pct. Points) and for those with lower educational expectations (6pct. Points)*	1.1 Mathematica Upward Bound evaluation, 1999, next update 2000.
2. **Increase participation and completion rates of disadvantaged persons in the academic pipeline in 2-year or 4-year colleges.**	2.1 **Postsecondary completion of Upward Bound participants.** Upward Bound participants who enroll in postsecondary education will complete 2-or 4-year postsecondary education programs at rates higher than comparable non-participants.	*Preliminary evaluation results indicate that Upward Bound has a limited but statistically significant effect on college persistence, but a large effect on persistence of students who are academically at-risk and have lower educational expectations.*	2.1 Mathematica Upward Bound evaluation, 1999, update in 2000.
	2.2 **Postsecondary completion of Student Support Services participants.** Student Support Services (SSS) participants will persist and complete 2-or 4-year postsecondary education programs at higher rates than comparable non-participants.	*SSS recipients were 7 percentage points more likely to return to the same school for the second year than were comparable non-SSS recipients (67% vs. 60%). They were also 3 percentage points more likely to complete two years of college at any school (77% vs. 74%).*	2.2 Westat SSS evaluation, 1999.
3. **Increase participation and completion rates of disadvantaged persons in the academic pipeline through graduate school.**	3.1 **Graduate school enrollment and completion**. Participants in the McNair program will enroll in and complete graduate and doctoral programs at higher rates than comparable non-participants.	*According to the Baccalaureate and Beyond study, only 13.1%t of low-income, first-generation college students receiving baccalaureate degrees in 1995-96 enrolled in graduate school compared with 18.5% of those who were not low-income, first-generation college students.*	3.1 McNair annual performance reports, 1999.

TRIO Programs--$630,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To increase educational participation of disadvantaged students through effective management of the federal TRIO Programs.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Supports Objective 3.1 (secondary school students get college preparatory support) and Objective 3.2 (postsecondary students receive support for high quality education) by funding organizations to provide the necessary support services to enable disadvantaged students to purse postsecondary opportunities.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Sources, Periodicity, Next Update
Management improvement			
4. **Improve service delivery and customer satisfaction.**	4.1 **Streamlined grants award process.** The time from receipt of applications to the notification/awards to grantees will be reduced. 4.2 **Customer satisfaction.** Customer survey data will indicate improved satisfaction with response to information requests and the usefulness of the information received.	*The current average time elapsed is approximately 10 months. The target for FY 2000 is 9 months.* *82% of those responding to 1998 TRIO customer satisfaction survey were pleased with the technical assistance received from Department of Education staff.*	4.1 ED grant review schedule, annual, 1999. 4.2 Customer survey (PES & OPE), annual, 1999.

Key Strategies

- Redesigned performance reports (some still to be cleared by OMB) will allow OPE staff to better measure the success of funded projects in meeting the goals of the federal TRIO programs. OPE staff will use the data to provide better feedback to grantees on project and student performance that may be used to improve the quality and effectiveness of funded projects.
- OPE has undertaken a number of initiatives to better serve our customers, including the following:
  - Streamlining the grants award process,
  - Posting application packages for TRIO funding on the web;
  - Conducting application preparation workshops to encourage more high quality applications for TRIO funding.
- TRIO clearinghouse will continue to provide information on effective intervention and opportunity programs and to track the number of requests for information.
- The Department of Education will continue to disseminate information on effective practices and strategies obtained from the national evaluation studies of the Student Support Services and Upward Bound programs.

GEAR UP--$240,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To ensure that disadvantaged middle school and secondary school students are prepared for, pursue, and succeed in postsecondary education.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Supports objective 3.1 (secondary school students get the information, skills, and support they need to prepare successfully for postsecondary education) by creating local partnership and state programs to provide information and individualized support services such as mentoring and tutoring, to middle and secondary school students and their parents to help students prepare for postsecondary education.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
Student and school outcomes			
1. **Increase the academic performance and preparation for postsecondary education of participating students.**	1.1 **Completion of academically challenging curricula.** Program participants will successfully complete college preparatory courses such as algebra, geometry, chemistry, and physics at higher rates than comparable non-participants.	*New program*	1.1 Annual program performance reports and program evaluation study, 2001.
	1.2 **Student attendance, retention, on-time promotion, and graduation.** Program participants will be promoted to the next grade level on-time at higher rates than comparable non-participants, will have higher rates of attendance in school, and will complete high school at higher rates than comparable non-participants.		1.2 Annual program performance reports and program evaluation study, 2000.
	1.3 **Professional development.** An increasing percentage of teachers of participating students will report participating in professional development activities designed to help teachers prepare students for postsecondary education.		1.3 Annual program performance reports and program evaluation study, 2000.
2. **Increase educational expectations for participating students and student and family knowledge of postecondary education options and financing.**	2.1 **Knowledge of postsecondary education costs and financing.** Program participants and their parents will have a more accurate knowledge of postsecondary education costs and available financial aid than comparable non-participants.	*New program*	2.1 Annual program performance reports and program evaluation study, 2000.
	2.2 **Student, family, teacher, and counselor expectations.** Participating students and their families, teachers, and guidance counselors will have higher educational expectations than comparable non-participants.		2.2 Annual program performance reports and program evaluation study, 2000.

GEAR UP–$240,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To ensure that disadvantaged middle school and secondary school students are prepared for, pursue, and succeed in postsecondary education.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Supports objective 3.1 (secondary school students get the information, skills, and support they need to prepare successfully for postsecondary education) by creating local partnership and state programs to provide information and individualized support services such as mentoring and tutoring, to middle and secondary school students and their parents to help students prepare for postsecondary education.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
	2.3 **Parental Involvement.** The percentage of parents and guardians who meet with teachers or guidance counselors about their child's education at least once per year will show continuous improvement.		2.3 Annual program performance reports and program evaluation study, 2000.
3. **Increase the participation rate of students at participating high-poverty middle and secondary schools in postsecondary education.**	3.1 **Postsecondary enrollment.** Program participants will enroll in postsecondary education programs at higher rates than comparable non-participants.	*New program*	3.1 Annual program performance reports and program evaluation study, 2005.
4. **Provide comprehensive early intervention services and financial assistance to low-income and academically at-risk students.**	4.1 **Provision of services to low-income and academically at-risk students.** State and partnership programs will have high levels of participation by low-income and academically at-risk students.	*New program*	4.1 Annual program performance reports and program evaluation study, 2000.
	4.2 **Comprehensive services.** A high percentage of state and partnership programs will provide a comprehensive package of early intervention services, including mentoring, tutoring, and individualized support to program participants.		4.2 Annual program performance reports and program evaluation study, 2000.
5. **Ensure that effective partnerships are established among middle schools and secondary schools, institutions of higher education, community-based organizations and businesses.**	5.1 **Satisfaction of partnership members.** A high percentage of partnership members will report satisfaction with the amount of collaboration and communication between partners.	*New program*	5.1 Annual program performance reports and program evaluation study, 2000.

Key Strategies

- Work with national organizations such as the Ford Foundation to widely disseminate information to prospective applicants, collect and report information on best practices, and support high-quality projects.
- Support partnerships among colleges, high-poverty middle and secondary schools, and national and community-based organizations and businesses that promote curricular and pedagogical improvements and provide opportunities for professional development related to college awareness and preparation for partner school faculty and staff.
- Provide assistance to projects through a variety of venues such as conferences, publications, listservs, and a Web site.
- Work with the community to develop program regulations and other program requirements that impose minimal burden while providing grantee flexibility and ensuring program integrity and accountability.

Robert C. Byrd Honors Scholarships Program--$39,859,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To promote student excellence and achievement and to recognize exceptionally able students who show promise of continued excellence.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: This objective supports Strategic Plan goal 3, which focuses on ensuring that all students motivated and academically ready to attend postsecondary education have the financial resources and support services needed to do so.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Sources, Periodicity, Next Update
1. **Encourage states to award all scholarship funds received to eligible high school graduates.**	1.1 **Awarding of scholarships**. By the beginning of each school year, 100% of the states and territories will award 100% of new scholarship funds received.	*Currently, approximately 90% of the states and territories award all scholarship funds by the beginning of each school year.*	1.1 Performance report, annual, 1999.
	1.2 **Reallocation of scholarships.** By the beginning of each school year, 100% of the states and territories will reallocate 100% of scholarship funds resulting from students who do not maintain scholarship requirements.	*Approximately 90% of states and territories reallocate funds by the next matriculation period.*	1.2 Performance Report, annual, 1999.

Key Strategies

- Revise performance report to collect all information needed.
- Communicate with state agencies at the beginning of the school year and mid-year to highlight the importance of awarding all funds.

Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need (GAANN)--$41,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: **To provide a fellowship program to assist graduate students of superior ability who are studying in areas of national need.**

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Supports Objective 3.2 (postsecondary students receive support for high-quality education) by providing grants to institutions to support high-quality graduate students studying in areas of national need.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Sources, Periodicity, Next Update
1. Increase the graduation rate of students in areas of national need, including those of underrepresented and financially needy groups.	1.1 **Graduate school completion**. There will be an increase in the percentage rate of U.S. citizens and permanent residents who receive a GAANN fellowship and obtain a doctorate in an area of national need. 1.2 **Percentage enrollment of targeted populations.** There will be an increase in the number of financially needy U.S. citizens and permanent residents who receive a GAANN grant to pursue a doctorate in designated areas of national need.		1.1 NSF study, 1999; Performance Reports, 1999 1.2 NSF study, 1999; Performance Reports, annual, 1999
2. Time to degree completion will be less than the national average (for Javits recipients).	2.1 **Time to degree completion.** Persons receiving a Javits fellowship will receive a doctorate in fields of the Arts, Humanities, or Social Sciences in less time than the national average.	*1996 Survey of Earned Doctorates indicated the 7.2 year average.*	2.1 NSF Study, 1999; Survey of Earned Doctorates, 1999; Survey of Javits grantees, 1999.

Key Strategies:

- ❖ We will develop an evaluation instrument to determine the number of fellows awarded degrees by the grantee in a designated area of need.
- ❖ We plan to enhance our monitoring procedures, which provide information regarding the progress of students toward their degree completion.
- ❖ We will conduct regional workshops to encourage grantees to increase their outreach and recruitment efforts as a means of fostering the enrollment of students from traditionally underrepresented backgrounds. Data will be collected on an annual basis via our Annual Performance Report.
- ❖ Fellowships will be provided to students who show exceptional promise.
- ❖ We will develop a survey instrument to collect graduation data for Javits participants.

Child Care Access Means Parents in School Program--$5,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: **To improve access to postsecondary education for low-income parents by providing high-quality child care services.**

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Supports Objective 3.2 (postsecondary students receive support for high-quality education) by providing grants to postsecondary institutions to increase the availability of campus-based child care services to low-income parents so that they can participate in postsecondary education.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
1. **Increase access for low-income parents to postsecondary institutions.**	1.1 **Children served.** The number of children from low-income student families served by the on-campus child care center will increase.	*New program.*	1.1 Program or survey data, annual, 1999.
	1.2 **Number of institutions.** The number of institutions receiving awards will increase.	*New program.*	1.2 Program data, annual, 1999.

Key Strategies

- Program staff will meet with higher education associations and child care advocacy organizations to promote the program.
- Create a web page to provide information about the grant program and help disseminate grant applications.
- Program staff will provide technical assistance workshops in strategic sites across the country.
- Program staff will coordinate with other interested government departments and agencies (e.g., Child Care Bureau) to promote the program and dissemination of the grant application.
- Additional staff will be hired and trained to provide technical assistance to our customers.

Learning Anytime Anywhere Partnerships--$20,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To expand access to postsecondary education and lifelong learning through the use of technology to all citizens who are unable to take advantage of on-campus programs.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Supports Objective 3.2 (postsecondary students receive support for high-quality education) by providing grants to postsecondary institutions to support pilot projects using technology and other innovations to enhance the delivery of postsecondary education and lifelong learning opportunities for all citizens, in all settings.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
1. Develop partnerships by providing the opportunity for educational institutions (including 4-year institutions, community colleges, technical institutes, and adult literacy and education programs) to partner with curriculum and software developers, network providers, community agencies, business and industry, in an effort to deliver a valuable and quality education to a variety of students.	1.1 **Number of partnerships.** The number of partnerships formed will equal the estimate provided in the Department's FY 1999 budget request and will remain level or increase each year.	*The FY 1999 budget request estimated that 45 partnerships will be formed.*	1.1 Program data, annual, 1999.
2. Increase access to non-traditional education for the diverse groups to be served by this program.	2.1 **Number of students served.** The number of students served by partnerships will increase each year.	*New program.*	2.1 Program data, annual, 1999.
3. Enhance quality and accountability within the program to ensure that students are learning the specific competencies required for the desired skills.	3.1 **Employment rate/earnings.** The employment rate and annual earnings of students served by Learning Anytime Anywhere Partnerships (LAAP) will be at least as great as those of comparable non-participants.	*New program.*	3.1 Program data, annual, 2001; Census data, annual, 2001

Key Strategies

- Encourage coordination and interaction among all of the partnership entities to expand students' options beyond the level of what individual providers currently offer.
- Support the expansion of geographical and institutional boundaries so that courses, faculty, development costs, and network facilities can be shared, creating economies of scale to make it financially feasible for providers while substantially increasing opportunities for students.
- Establish mechanisms for ensuring that educational providers, employers, and students have confidence that the degree or certificate will provide skills needed for careers and further education.
- Help to coordinate the needs of employers and the requirement of further education with the services of educational providers to ensure that the federal investment in this program is worthwhile.

Preparing for College--$15,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: **To ensure that junior and senior high school students and their families, as well as adults, have an accurate understanding of the requirements for postsecondary education, including the academic preparation necessary and the costs of attending a postsecondary institution, and that these students pursue at increasing rates their participation in postsecondary education.**

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Supports Objective 3.1 (secondary school students get college preparatory support) by disseminating information about the financial and academic requirements for postsecondary attendance.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
Student and family measures			
1. Increase the understanding of the academic preparation and financial resources needed for postsecondary education, including the availability of financial assistance, among junior and senior high school students and their families, as well as adults.	1.1 **Knowledge of college costs.** Increasing percentages of students from age 12 through high school and their parents will have an accurate assessment of the cost of attending college and the aid available for college by 2002.	*Parents of middle-school children currently overestimate college tuition and fees by significant amounts. On average, parents estimated 1997-98 tuition and fees at a 2-year public college at $6,554 (the actual figure was $1,501), at a 4-year public university at $10,204 (the actual figure was $3,111), and at a 4-year private university at $19,847 (the actual figure was $13,664).*	1.1 Baseline Gallup survey; thereafter National Household Education Survey, biannual, 1999.
	1.2 **Knowledge of academic requirements.** The percentage of students from age 12 through high school and their parents who obtain information on the academic requirements for college or postsecondary vocational enrollment will increase annually.	*A majority of parents indicated that they had little or no information, or would like more information, about the courses their child should take for college (68%), the cost of attending college (72%), financial aid (82%), types of colleges and college programs (77%), and other ways of paying for college, such as tax credits (89%). In most cases, parents without a college degree and parents with lower incomes were more likely than others to express a desire for information.*	1.2 Baseline Gallup survey; thereafter National Household Education Survey, biannual, 1999.
Management measures			
2. Ensure that program dissemination strategies meet the information needs of the target audience.	2.1 **Customer satisfaction.** Surveys of customers will show that the information disseminated via this program meets the information needs of the target audience.	*New program*	2.1 Surveys, annual, 1999.

Key Strategies

- ❖ Develop and implement a national information dissemination program. This program will be targeted to junior and senior high school students and their families, as well as adults. It will increase awareness of the growing need to continue education beyond high school and will increase awareness of the costs of postsecondary education, opportunities for financial assistance, and academic requirements for pursuing a postsecondary education. Although information will be disseminated nationally, dissemination strategies will be tailored to reflect the specific needs of different audiences and circumstances.
- ❖ Undertake regular assessments of customer satisfaction, through surveys and focus groups, to assess whether information dissemination strategies meet customer needs, are effective in communicating with the target audiences, and provide relevant information in a timely manner.

College Completion Challenge Grants --$35,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To narrow the gap in persistence between at-risk students and other students by providing grants to colleges to finance the costs of activities shown to improve the persistence of disadvantaged students.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Supports Objective 3.2 (postsecondary students receive support for high-quality education) by providing grants to postsecondary institutions to develop programs to increase the retention of students who are at risk of dropping out of postsecondary education.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
1. **Increase the capacity of at-risk students to complete their college education.**	1.1 **Narrowing of persistence gap.** The gap in persistence rates between high- and low-income students will decrease at institutions receiving program funding.	*New program*	1.1 Program data, annual, 2000.

Key Strategies

- Target program publicity to promote applications from schools having high percentages of low-income students.
- Disseminate evidence of best practices obtained from program evaluation to all higher education institutions.

Expansion of D.C. College Access Program--$17,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To complement the D.C. College Access Program by providing institutional subsidies to public institutions of higher education in Virginia and Maryland on behalf of D.C. residents who graduated recently from public or private high schools.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Supports Objective 3.2 (postsecondary students receive support for high-quality education) by allowing over 3,000 graduates from D.C. public and private high schools to pay in-state tuition at all Maryland and Virginia colleges.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
1. **To increase access to postsecondary education opportunities for recent D.C. public and private high school graduates and GED recipients.**	1.2 **Students served.** The number of students receiving funding under this program will increase each year.	*Currently no students receive these benefits. It is expected that over 3,000 high school graduates, GED recipients and private high school graduates will receive benefits during the program's first year.*	1.2 Program data, annual, 1999.

Key Strategies

- Several partnerships, including a private sector group led by the Washington Post, are working to spread awareness of increased options to attend public institutions in the surrounding jurisdictions.
- The Department will provide extensive technical assistance to D.C. middle schools to encourage them to form partnerships to apply for GEAR-UP funding.

Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants (HEA, II)--$115,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: **To improve the quality of teacher education and initial certification standards, and to improve the knowledge and skills of all teachers, particularly new teachers and teachers who work in high-need areas.**

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: The three initiatives authorized under Title II support Objective 1.4 (A talented and dedicated teacher is in every classroom in America) by providing competitive grants to States for comprehensive teacher quality reforms; by providing competitive grants to partnerships of districts and institutions of higher education for fundamental improvements in teacher education; and by providing competitive grants to States and partnerships for new strategies for reducing shortages of qualified teachers in high-need areas.

Objective	Indicators	Performance Data	Sources, Periodicity, Next Update
State Grants			
1. **Improve the skills and knowledge of new teachers by funding the development of state policies that strengthen initial licensing standards, reduce the number of uncertified teachers, and strengthen procedures for holding teacher training institutions accountable for producing highly qualified teachers.**	1.1 **Teacher certification standards**. States that use their teacher enhancement grant to strengthen standards for initial teacher certification will demonstrate adoption of higher standards within 2 years of grant award. Within 1 year of grant award, states will demonstrate progress toward adoption of higher standards. 1.2 **Number of uncertified teachers.** Grantee states will show evidence of annual reductions in the number of uncertified teachers throughout the grant period. 1.3 **Program accountability.** States that use their teacher enhancement grant to hold teacher training programs accountable for the quality of the training they offer will demonstrate that increasing numbers of graduates are passing the state certification each year.	*New Program*	1.1 State Grant Accountability Report and National Evaluation, 2000. 1.2 State Grant Accountability Reports and National Evaluation, 2000. 1.3 State Grant Accountability Reports and National Evaluation, 2000.
Partnership Grants			
2. **Improve the quality of the teacher preparation programs at the partner institutions.**	2.1 **Induction program.** Each year the percentage of teaching students who receive on-going support and education (induction program supports) from their partnership, pre-service training program during their first three years of teaching will increase.	*New Program*	2.1 Partnership Evaluation Reports, and National Evaluation, 2001.

Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants (HEA, II)--$115,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: **To improve the quality of teacher education and initial certification standards, and to improve the knowledge and skills of all teachers, particularly new teachers and teachers who work in high-need areas.**

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: The three initiatives authorized under Title II support Objective 1.4 (A talented and dedicated teacher is in every classroom in America) by providing competitive grants to States for comprehensive teacher quality reforms; by providing competitive grants to partnerships of districts and institutions of higher education for fundamental improvements in teacher education; and by providing competitive grants to States and partnerships for new strategies for reducing shortages of qualified teachers in high-need areas.

Objective	Indicators	Performance Data	Sources, Periodicity, Next Update
	2.2 **Enrollment in academic courses offered in whole or in part by the school of arts and sciences.** The number of academic courses taken by teaching students at the partnership institutions will increase each year. ("Academic courses" are those offered in academic content areas by the schools of arts and sciences, or jointly offered by the schools of arts and sciences and the school of education.)	*New Program*	2.2 Partnership Evaluation Reports, and National Evaluation, 2001.
	2.3 **Process for program self–assessment.** The percentage of partnership institutions, that have a formal process for assessing the effectiveness of their graduates as classroom teachers will increase each year until it reaches 95%.		2.3 Partnership Evaluation Reports, and National Evaluation, 2001.
3. **Improve the placement and retention rates of graduates from partner institutions.**	3.1 **Certification rate.** The percentage of graduates from partnership institutions who meet the certification requirements of the state, including passage of content knowledge or competency tests will increase.	*New Program*	3.1 Partnership Evaluation Reports and National Evaluation, 2001.
	3.2 **Retention rate.** The percentage of graduates from partnership institutions who remain in teaching for 3 consecutive years after graduation will increase.		3.2 Partnership Evaluation Reports and National Evaluation, 2001.
	3.3 **Service in high-poverty schools.** The percentage of graduates from partnership institutions who serve in high-poverty schools will increase.		3.3 National Evaluation, 2001.
324		325	

Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants (HEA, II)--$115,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To improve the quality of teacher education and initial certification standards, and to improve the knowledge and skills of all teachers, particularly new teachers and teachers who work in high-need areas.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: The three initiatives authorized under Title II support Objective 1.4 (A talented and dedicated teacher is in every classroom in America) by providing competitive grants to States for comprehensive teacher quality reforms; by providing competitive grants to partnerships of districts and institutions of higher education for fundamental improvements in teacher education; and by providing competitive grants to States and partnerships for new strategies for reducing shortages of qualified teachers in high-need areas.

Objective	Indicators	Performance Data	Sources, Periodicity, Next Update
4. Increase the connections that the teacher preparation programs at partnership institutions have with low-income urban and rural schools in the surrounding region.	4.1 **Assessment of staffing needs**. The percentage of partnership institutions that conduct a formal assessment of the staffing needs of local districts, and that have a governance body that monitors the effectiveness of the program and includes K-12 teachers and administrators, faculty from the college of arts and sciences and the college of teacher education, will increase each year.	*New Program*	4.1 National Evaluation, 2001.
5. Increase in the skills of teachers in using technology.	5.1 **Technology skills.** The percentage of graduates from partnership institutions who report that they are able to use technology to improve teaching and learning will increase.	*New Program*	5.1 Partnership Evaluation Reports and National Evaluation, 2001.
Recruitment Grants			
6. Increase the availability of well-prepared teachers for low-income, urban, and rural school districts.	6.1 **Licensure requirements**. In districts with grantees, the percentage of individuals who teach in low-income communities who satisfy all State licensure requirements will increase.	*New Program*	6.1 Grantee reports and National Evaluation, 2001.
	6.2 **Teacher induction programs**. In districts with grantees, the percentage of teachers in urban and rural school districts who participate in formal induction programs during their first three years of teaching will increase.		6.2 Grantee reports and National evaluation, 2001.
	6.3 **Retention rates**. The percentage of qualified, new teachers who continue to teach in the high-need, partner districts for more than 3 years will increase.		6.3 Grantee reports and National Evaluation, 2001.

Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants (HEA, II)--$115,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To improve the quality of teacher education and initial certification standards, and to improve the knowledge and skills of all teachers, particularly new teachers and teachers who work in high-need areas.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: The three initiatives authorized under Title II support Objective 1.4 (A talented and dedicated teacher is in every classroom in America) by providing competitive grants to States for comprehensive teacher quality reforms; by providing competitive grants to partnerships of districts and institutions of higher education for fundamental improvements in teacher education; and by providing competitive grants to States and partnerships for new strategies for reducing shortages of qualified teachers in high-need areas.

Key Strategies

Disseminate information to grantees and prospective grantees:

- Disseminate information about the strategies that some states have used to improve certification standards, reduce the number of uncertified teachers, and hold teacher-training programs accountable for training highly skilled teachers.
- Disseminate information about upcoming awards program for teacher education programs and the lessons learned from the award winners. For example, learn how the programs measure the effectiveness of their graduates.
- Disseminate information on ways the Eisenhower Professional Development Program and other related programs can be used to support the program goals.
- Disseminate information on best practices.
- Provide information on teaching opportunities to students and recent graduates.

Coordinate with other programs and organizations:

- Coordinate efforts with National Science Foundation teacher preparation programs.
- Work with professional organizations such as AACTE to promote program goals.

Provide technical assistance and facilitate communication among grantees:

- Sponsor activities such as focus groups, conferences, or workshops where participating partners can exchange information and ideas to enhance the success of the program.
- Sponsor workshops to help grantees coordinate with the Eisenhower Professional Development Program.
- Provide technical assistance to partnerships in the development of assessment instruments.
- Help grantee institutions share information on effective strategies.

Underground Railroad Program--$1,750,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: **To promote the research, display, interpretation, and collection of artifacts relating to the history of the Underground Railroad and to make the interpretive efforts available to institutions of higher education.**

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: None.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
1. **Assist nonprofit educational associations in building public-private partnerships and creating endowment funds to support museum operations.**	1.2 **Program funding.** Program funds are provided on a timely manner to eligible organizations and usage of funds are monitored to ensure that the program's purposes are carried out.	*New program.*	1.1 Program data, annual, 1999.

Key Strategy

- Publicize program to ensure participation by qualifying partnerships.

GPRA Data/Evaluation Program--$4,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To improve the type and quality of information available about the performance of the postsecondary education programs funded by the Department of Education.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Supports all objectives in Goal 3 (to ensure access to postsecondary education and lifelong learning) by providing data on program performance for the postsecondary education programs that support these objectives

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
1. To fund studies and data collections needed to assess the performance of the Department's postsecondary education programs.	1.1 **Indicators.** In the FY 1999 Performance Report (due March 31, 2000), the Department will have data on program performance for 95% of indicators relevant to the postsecondary education programs.	*Among postsecondary programs funded in FY 1998 (for which performance data could be expected to be available), accurate baseline data are available for approximately 75% of indicators.*	1.2 GPRA Performance Report, annual, 1999.

Key Strategies

- Fund studies that use available data from NCES, administrative records, Census Bureau, and other federal agencies to provide information on the performance of the postsecondary education programs
- Identify remaining information needs and fund targeted data collections to obtain the needed data.

Howard University–$219,444,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To assist Howard University with financial resources needed to carry out its educational mission.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Supports Objective 3.2 (postsecondary students receive support for high-quality education) by assisting Howard University in its mission to serve disadvantaged students by providing a high-quality education.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
University development			
1. **Maintain and strengthen academic programs and achievement by:** ➢ **Recruiting better students** ➢ **Improving student retention** ➢ **Improving graduation rates** ➢ **Promoting excellence in teaching.**	1.1 **Better students.** The average SAT scores of incoming freshman will increase by 1% per year.	*Average SAT score in fall 1997 was 1,007, a 6 point increase over fall 1996, when the average score was 1,001. The national average in 1997 was 1,016.*	1.1 Howard University, annual, 1999.
	1.2 **Student retention.** Decrease attrition for undergraduate FTIC students by 2 percent until national average is bettered.	*For full-time FTIC students who enrolled in fall 1995, 83% returned in fall 1996. This first year attrition rate of 17% is at or below the national average. The second-year attrition rate of 29% is also considered good.*	1.2 Howard University, annual, 1999.
	1.3 **Graduation rates.** The undergraduate and graduate graduation rates will increase by 2% per year until the national average is reached or exceeded.	*6-year graduation rate for FY 1997 is 49%. For FY 1996, the graduation rate was 46%t. The target for 2000 is 53%.*	1.3 Howard University, annual, 1999.
	1.4 **Excellence in teaching and scholarship.** The participation rate of faculty in activities of the Fund for Academic Excellence will increase.	*New program guidelines were developed and distributed in October 1997. 66 proposals were funded to enhance teaching and learning in categories such as faculty development, workshops, curriculum development, and faculty seminars.*	1.4 Howard University, annual, 1999.
2. **Promote excellence in research.**	2.1 **Grants received.** The number of grant proposals that are funded will increase.	*232 grants were funded in 1997, compared with 224 in 1996. The target for 2000 is to increase both the number of proposals submitted and the number of awards received by 20% over 1997 levels.*	2.1 Howard University, annual, 1999.
	2.2 **Grant funding.** The total funds received through research grants will increase. The target for 2000 is a 20% increase over the 1997 level.	*In FY 1997, $45,268,427 was received in research grant funds. The amount for FY 1996 was $46,980,535. Workshops were conducted for 137 faculty in FY 1997 compared with 36 faculty in FY 1996.*	2.2 Howard university, annual, 1999.

Howard University--$219,444,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To assist Howard University with financial resources needed to carry out its educational mission.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Supports Objective 3.2 (postsecondary students receive support for high-quality education) by assisting Howard University in its mission to serve disadvantaged students by providing a high-quality education.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
3. Increase Howard University's financial strength and independence from federal appropriations.	3.2 **Endowment.** The value of the endowment each year will increase. The target for 2000 is a 10% increase over the 1997 level.	*The market value of the endowment fund grew to $211.2 million, as of June 30,1997, an increase of 19.7 % over its value of $176.5 million in June 30, 1996.*	3.1 Howard University, annual, 1999.
	3.3 **Outside support.** The funds raised from all private sources will increase.	*In FY 1997, contributions from private sources totaled $11,791,191, an 11%t increase over the FY 1996 amount of $10,614,358.*	3.2 Howard University, annual, 1999.
	3.4 **Outside support--alumni**. The participation rate of alumni who contribute to the school will increase.	*In 1997 the alumni participation exceeded the goal of 10%. This more than doubled the FY 1996 level of almost 5%. The goal for 2000 is 25%.*	3.3 Howard University, annual, 1999.
	3.4 **Cost savings at the Howard University Hospital**. The difference between the hospital's net revenue (excluding federal appropriations) and total expenses will decrease.	*For FY 1997, there were a $29.3 million loss before the federal appropriation and a $200,000 surplus after the federal appropriation. These figures were an improvement over FY 1996, when there were a $33.4 million loss before federal appropriation and a $3.9 million loss after federal appropriation. For 2000, the goal is to have a $29.5 million difference before federal appropriation and to "break even" with the appropriation.*	3.4 Howard University, annual. 1999.

Howard University--$219,444,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To assist Howard University with financial resources needed to carry out its educational mission.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: Supports Objective 3.2 (postsecondary students receive support for high-quality education) by assisting Howard University in its mission to serve disadvantaged students by providing a high-quality education.

Key Strategies

- Recruit good students by targeting high-ability students in schools across the country; by convening summer high school counselors in a symposium and Honors Student weekend; by encouraging alumni to identify and contact high-ability students; and by expanding publicity on student leaders and achievers, as well as outstanding programs.
- Increase retention and graduation rates by improving orientation programs; by replacing the Mid-term Deficiency Report with a Mid-term Status Report to alert all undergraduate students of their standing at midterm; by continuing regular assessment of students' academic standings; by convening faculty adviser workshops; and by providing written correspondence to faculty on retention goals and issues.
- Implement degree adult program.
- Expand research support by improving post-award grant administration and faculty support by the Office of Research Administration; by conducting faculty workshops on "how to win grants and contracts"; by increasing the distribution of grant announcements; and by installing computer workstations for all full-time faculty.
- Continue to monitor external money managers who invest Howard's endowment fund to ensure continued healthy returns.
- Improve fundraising by conducting a national media campaign with articles in national publications (e.g. the New York Times, Washington Post, Christian Science Monitor, Chronicle of Higher Education) featuring Howard University; by intensifying and broadening the direct mail campaign; by inaugurating an annual fund campaign and a systematic program of communication with alumni; by continuing to manage to contain costs; by continuing marketing efforts to feature recent improvements in equipment and service; and by under taking a long-term strategic planning effort spearheaded by a special committee of Howard University Board of Trustees.

Research and Improvement

340

341

National Education Research Institutes--$108,782,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: Conduct high quality research and development that contribute to educational improvement

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan:

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
1. Education research is responsive to the high priority needs of education policy makers and practitioners.	1.1 **High priority needs.** Expert panels find OERI supported research to be responsive to the high priority needs of education policy makers and practitioners. 1.2 OERI supported research is cited in periodicals for education practitioners and policymakers.	*Research priorities of the Interagency Education Research Initiative were developed through a series of workshops that brought together nationally recognized researchers and practitioners in education.*	1.1 New system of expert review; Fall 1999. 1.2 Analysis of periodicals for education practitioners and policymakers; Fall 1999.
2. Education research reflects accepted standards of technical merit and evidence.	2.1 **Technical Merit.** Expert panels find OERI supported research to meet fully acceptable scientific quality. 2.2 OERI supported research is published and cited in scholarly research journals.	*Interim peer review of 10 OERI R&D centers were completed in 1998.* *Improved peer review system initiated for FY1999 Field Initiated Studies competition to ensure that only the highest quality proposals will be funded.*	2.1 New system of expert review; Fall 1999. 2.2 Analysis of scholarly-research journals; Fall 1999
3. The findings and products of education research are useful to policy makers and practitioners.	3.1 **Usefulness.** Expert panels find OERI supported research and products to be useful to policy makers and practitioners.	▪ *CPRE has informed standards-based reform nationally, with MI, DE, MA, and MO relying heavily on their research to design state initiatives.* ▪ *CRESST is working directly with the LA Unified School District and Chicago Public Schools in revising their assessment systems and revamping their MIS systems to track student progress, enhance reporting (particularly for Title I students), and make informed data base decisions.* ▪ *CRESST has helped states develop new assessment systems aligned to their state content standards including CA, WA, KY, MD, HI, AZ, CO, TX, VT, and WY.* ▪ *CRESPAR's comprehensive approaches to educating students at-risk of academic failure has been adopted by over 1100 school in 44 states and the adoptions continue to grow.*	3.1 New system of expert review; Fall 1999; NCES Customer Survey, 1999; Independent evaluation of regional laboratories, Fall 1999.

National Education Research Institutes--$108,782,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: Conduct high quality research and development that contribute to educational improvement

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan

Key Strategies

- Form partnerships with other agencies such as NSF and NICHD on the Interagency Education Research Initiative and the replication of the TIMMS study of 8th graders.
- Strengthen internal research capacity by continuing to recruit visiting scholars though the National Academy of Sciences and initiating a new OERI fellowship program.
- Ensure that research and development activities are of high quality by asking an expert research panel to develop guidelines to judge the quality of education research.
- Conduct external and internal quality reviews of products and activities of grantees and contractors following OERI's Phase III performance standards.
- OERI National Educational Research Policy and Priorities Board has asked the National Academy of Education to develop a long-term research agenda to solve critical problems in education
- Maintain an accessible, up-to-date inventory of education research activities.

Regional Educational Laboratories--$65,000,000 (FY2000)

Goal: To promote knowledge-based educational improvement to help all students meet high standards through development, applied research, dissemination, and technical assistance conducted with local, state, and intermediate agencies.

Relationship of Program Goal to Strategic Plan: Program objectives relate to the Department's strategic objectives 4.2 and 4.3 in providing a range of services and up-to-date knowledge to support comprehensive school reform efforts.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
Field-based Development and Applied Research			
1. Develop, adapt, and assess comprehensive education reform strategies in schools, districts, and states.	1.1 **Number of development sites**. An increasing number of local or state sites will be engaged in collaborative development and demonstration of comprehensive reform-related efforts.	*In 1997, there were 478 baseline development sites. Baseline sites involve approximately 81,800 students, 5,790 teachers, 500 administrators, and 14,400 parents. 1999 surveys will sample partners.*	1.1 Laboratory records and quarterly reports, 1999.
	1.2 **Quality of work at sites.** More than 80% of partners sampled will rate the effort as contributing to comprehensive reform.		1.2 Laboratory partner surveys, 1999.
	1.3 **Student achievement**. After 3 years of on-site development, sites will show increases in student achievement. Assessments of achievement in 2000.		1.3 State or local assessments, 2000.
Client Services and Product Dissemination			
2. Provide products and services and develop networks and partnerships in support of state and local reform.	2.1 **Customer receipt of products and services**. Circulation of products, receipt of services, and receipt of electronic material will increase annually from baseline levels.	*In 1997, products were provided to 419,927 clients, services to 148,966 clients, 11,834,588 Web site hits.*	2.1 Laboratory records and quarterly reports, 1999.
	2.2 **Quality of products and services**. More than 90% of clients sampled will report laboratory products and services to be of high quality.	*In 1997, 90% of clients sampled rated quality of products and services to be excellent or good.*	2.2 Client surveys, 1999; ED external evaluation, 1999.
	2.3 **Utility of partnerships.** More than 80% of participants and partners sampled will report that partnership activities address significant concerns or expand capacity for effective work.	*In 1997, 80% reported that partnerships addressed significant concerns or expanded capacity of participants.*	2.3 Surveys of participants and partners in partnership activities, 1999.

Regional Educational Laboratories--$65,000,000 (FY2000)

Goal: **To promote knowledge-based educational improvement to help all students meet high standards through development, applied research, dissemination, and technical assistance conducted with local, state, and intermediate agencies.**

Relationship of Program Goal to Strategic Plan: Program objectives relate to the Department's strategic objectives 4.2 and 4.3 in providing a range of services and up-to-date knowledge to support comprehensive school reform efforts.

Key Strategies

- Laboratories will collaborate with state and local agencies to implement effective, research-based comprehensive reform strategies.
- Laboratories will develop and adapt tested models, policies, and strategies for educational improvement.
- OERI will establish contract priorities for laboratory work to focus on implementing comprehensive school reform and moving reform to scale.
- OERI will encourage and support laboratories to identify exemplary and promising comprehensive school reform practices.
- Laboratories will develop and adapt an array of research-based products and services for use by schools, districts, and states.
- Laboratories will provide a range of services from awareness to more in-depth and sustained collaborative activities.
- Laboratories will create and expand regional and nationwide networks and alliances with practitioners, policymakers, and other service providers to leverage resources and move education reform efforts to scale.
- OERI will broker laboratory services to other ED offices and federal agencies as appropriate to assist them in accomplishing their work objectives.
- OERI will assist in identifying opportunities for laboratories to collaborate with other agencies, as well as to work on cross-laboratory efforts in support of local and state reform.

Dissemination--$24,500,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To provide educators, policymakers, researchers, parents, and the public with awareness of, access to, and assistance in adapting and adopting useful products and services designed to improve American education.

Relationship of Program Goal to Strategic Plan: Goal 4: results, service quality, and customer satisfaction; objective 4.1 dissemination of high-quality information and products

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
1. Identify, develop, produce, and distribute high- quality products that meet customer needs and address Department priorities.	1.1 By 2000, the percentage of teachers, administrators, federal, state, and local policy makers, researchers, parents, and the general public who access OERI's products and services will increase by 10% each year.	*In the first three quarters of FY1998: 78.6 million Internet site visits, averaging 1.5 million per week; nearly 70,000 e-mail requests, averaging over 1,200 per week; nearly 75,000 toll-free calls, averaging 1,400 per week. (Baseline data not available by percentage or type of respondent. Future data reporting will include this information).*	1.1 Customer survey based upon NCES's "How Do We Measure Up?," annual, 2000. Customer survey to be included in all OERI publications and feedback from EDPUBS system, annual, 1999.
2. Ensure customer satisfaction with the high quality and usefulness of OERI's research and statistical products.	2.1 By 2000, the percentage of teachers, administrators, federal, state, and local policy makers, researchers, parents and the public who are highly satisfied with the high quality and usefulness of OERI's products will increase by 10% each year.	*According to a 1998 Fast Response Survey (NCES), Department resources were considered somewhat or very effective sources of information on comprehensive reform strategies by 40% to 61% of teachers consulting these sources.*	2.1 Customer survey based upon NCES' "How Do We Measure Up?", annual, 2000. Customer survey to be included in all OERI publications and feedback from EDPUBS system, annual, 1999.
3. Identify exemplary and promising education products and services based on research results.	3.1 By 2000, the number of exemplary or promising programs disseminated to schools and districts will increase by 10% each year.	*In 1999, approximately 10 math programs and 25 gender equity programs will be recommended as promising or exemplary. In 1998 two panels were added in the areas of Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Technology. Planning is under way for a fifth panel on Reading.*	3.1 Expert panel recommendations, 1999.

Key Strategies

- ❖ Implement Research Bytes, a product line designed to share the latest research findings coming from Labs, Centers, and grantees with a listserv that includes researchers and ED senior managers, but has the capacity for expansion to educators, policy makers, and the general public.
- ❖ Prepare comprehensive communication plan that is coordinated with EDPUBS distribution system and all government customer service initiatives.
- ❖ Obtain customer feedback to ensure that products reflect customer needs and priorities.
- ❖ Support the development of new panels in core content areas to achieve the goal of helping all children reach challenging academic standards.
- ❖ Provide timely and specific capacity building and technical assistance activities conducted by the Regional Labs, NCES University, etc.
- ❖ Obtain customer feedback on ways to improve the usefulness of technical assistance activities.
- ❖ Evaluate customer satisfaction through customer surveys and focus groups.

NCES Statistics and Assessment--$122,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To collect, analyze, and disseminate information on the condition of education in the U.S. and to provide comparative international statistics.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan:

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Sources, Periodicity, Next Update
Data Collection			
1.1 **Provides timely, useful, and comprehensive data that are relevant to policy and educational improvement.**	1.1 **Customer Satisfaction**. At least 85% of surveyed customers in FY 1999 and 90% in FY 2000 will agree that National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) data are timely, relevant, and comprehensive.	*Percentage of customer respondents satisfied or very satisfied in 1997* *NCES Publications:* ➢ *Comprehensiveness 88%* ➢ *Timeliness 72% - 88%** ➢ *Utility 86%* *NCES Data Files:* ➢ *Comprehensiveness 82%* ➢ *Timeliness 52% - 82%** *NCES Services:* ➢ *Comprehensiveness N/A* ➢ *Timeliness 89%* *Note(s): This % reflects a range responding to different products. Overall NCES customer satisfaction rating of 90%*	1.1 NCES 1997 Customer Satisfaction Survey (Next Survey: FY 1999)
2.1 **Collect High Quality Data**	2.1 **Customer Rating of Quality**. At least 85% of surveyed customers in FY 1999 and 90% in FY 2000 will agree that NCES data is of high quality in terms of accuracy, reliability, validity, and comprehensiveness.	Percentage of customer respondents satisfied or very satisfied *NCES Publications:* ➢ *Accuracy – N/A* ➢ *Overall Quality – 90%* *NCES Data Files:* ➢ *Accuracy – 74%* ➢ *Overall Quality – N/A*	2.1 NCES 1997 Customer Satisfaction Survey (Next Survey: FY 1999)
Data Analysis, Synthesis, and Packaging			
3. **Develop publications that are easy to read, useful, and of high overall quality.**	3.1 **Ease of Reading**. At least 85% of surveyed customers in FY 1999 and 90% in FY 2000 will agree that NCES publications are easy to read. 3.2 **Utility**. At least 85% of surveyed customers in FY 1999 and 90% in FY 2000 will rate NCES publications as useful to their work. 3.3 **Publication Quality**. At least 85% of surveyed customers in FY 1999 and 90% in FY 2000 will express satisfaction with the overall quality of NCES publications.	*Percentage of customer respondents satisfied or very satisfied in 1997:* ➢ *Clarity of Writing 87%* ➢ *Useful to Work 86%* ➢ *Overall Quality 90%* *Note: Baseline Performance Data for all NCES objectives represents results from the NCES 1997 Customer Satisfaction Survey Report.*	3.1-3.3 NCES 1997 Customer Satisfaction Survey (Next Survey: FY 1999) In FY 99 NCES will again measure customer satisfaction rates. This survey is a follow-up to the FY 1997 survey that established NCES baseline performance data. Also, in FY 99 NCES will conduct focus group discussions with targeted customers; including policy

NCES Statistics and Assessment--$122,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To collect, analyze, and disseminate information on the condition of education in the U.S. and to provide comparative international statistics.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan:

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Sources, Periodicity, Next Update
			makers, researchers, and practitioners. Other sources of feedback: Biannual input from NCES Advisory Council; Biennial NCES Customer Survey in 1997 and 1999.

Key Strategies

NCES is pursing two types of strategies: (1) we are listing the strategies that will be used to accomplish the goals and objectives in our FY 2000 Program Plan; and, (2) we will identify the strategies that we will us to link our program objectives to the Department's Strategic Plan.
Specifically NCES will show how it is working to comply with Strategic Plan Objective 4.1 "Our customers receive fast, seamless service and dissemination of high quality information and products"; and, Objective 4.3 "An up-to-date knowledge base is available from education research to support education reform and equality.

- NCES Program Plan Strategies are presented on Page 5.
- NCES actions that link its Program Objectives to the Department's Strategic Objectives 4.1 and 4.3 are presented on Pages 6 and 7.
- Strategy #1: Actions that will be or are being taken by NCES to accomplish its FY 2000 Program Plan Goals and Objectives.

Data Collection:

- NCES will continue to conduct focus group discussions with key customers and targeted surveys to assess and improve the timeliness, relevance, and comprehensiveness of its data (Obj. 1.1).
- NCES customer surveys will continue to rely on a core set of questions that will be administered to a representative sample of persons in successive years for use in reporting against performance measures (Obj. 1.1, 2.1, 3.1-3.3).
- NCES will develop new questions that will be added to customer surveys to solicit information for program improvement purposes (Same as above).
- NCES is currently working on program redesign activities for SASS, IPEDS, and its International Program (Obj. 2.1).
- NCES is developing a new early childhood survey (Obj. 1.1).
- NCES is involved in a number of collaborative activities with the Department of Justice, Census Bureau, Health and Human Services, Agriculture, and other Principal Offices in Education .
- NCES will conduct an internal analysis of processing times for its major data collections in an effort to improve timeliness. This improvement effort is expected to be completed in June 1999.
- NCES will coordinate with OSERS and OCR, and conduct a customer satisfaction survey of SEA's in FY 1999 to determine feasibility and projected burden reduction of collecting data about students with disabilities through a single coordinated survey.
- NCES will coordinate with OESE in FY 1999 a pilot project testing the electronic collection of a coordinated state level report and will build an integrated file accessible to multiple Departmental users.
- NCES will lead states and other POC's in a review and update of the student, staff, and discipline data handbooks to secure consensus on standard definition in FY 1999.
- NCES will provide PES with our statistical standards for dissemination to other Departmental POC's;
- NCES will participate in a future PES workgroup to help improve the Department's Data Quality Standards.
- NCES will provide technical consultation to POC's on future major data collection efforts.

Eisenhower Federal Activities--$30,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: **To improve teaching through the development and demonstration of high-quality professional development activities, the provision of high-quality instructional materials and information about effective programs, and the expansion of a cadre of highly accomplished teachers.**

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: The Eisenhower Professional Development Program: Federal Activities supports Objective 1.4 (A talented and dedicated teacher is in every classroom in America) and Objective 2.3 (Every eighth-grader masters challenging mathematics, including the foundations of algebra and geometry) by supporting grants to professional development demonstration projects and to the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. In addition, the program promotes access to high-quality math and science materials by supporting the Eisenhower National Clearinghouse.

Objective	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
Development and demonstration projects			
1. **Improve classroom instruction through effective professional development.**	1.1 **Quality of professional development.** At least 80% of the professional development models developed by projects will be rated as having high quality using a range of criteria and will demonstrate impacts.		1.1 Project reports of field studies, 2000; peer review evaluation, 2000; national evaluation, 2001. (contingent on obtaining funding for D&D projects)
Eisenhower National Clearinghouse for Mathematics and Science Education (ENC)			
2. **Provide access to high-quality instructional materials and information about exemplary programs in mathematics and science education for elementary and secondary schools.**	2.1 **Utility.** At least 80% of customers who use ENC products will report that the products meet their needs in terms of accessibility, relevance, and quality.		2.1 Customer surveys, 2000; national evaluation, 2000. (contingent on obtaining funding for D&D projects)
National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS)			
3. **Contribute to the improvement of the teaching and learning of all students by expanding the cadre of highly accomplished teachers.**	3.1 **Standards and assessments developed.** The number of standards and assessments developed, approved, and offered by the NBPTS will increase annually to at least 16 teaching fields by the year 2000, and reach a cumulative total of 25 teaching fields by the year 2002 if adequate resources are available.	*By early 1999, standards and assessments were developed, approved, and offered for 12 teaching fields. Assessments for 5 additional teaching fields are under development this year and will be offered in the school year 1999-2000. Twenty-one sets of standards have been completed and approved. The remaining standards and assessments for the full 25 certificate system are on target and will be offered to teachers by the school year 2001-2002.*	3.1 NBPTS reports, annual, 1999.
	3.2 **Teachers certified.** The number of teachers who will be awarded NBPTS certification will increase annually.	*By early 1999, 1835 teachers had been awarded NBPTS certification.*	3.2 NBPTS reports, annual, 1999.

Eisenhower Federal Activities--$30,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: **To improve teaching through the development and demonstration of high-quality professional development activities, the provision of high-quality instructional materials and information about effective programs, and the expansion of a cadre of highly accomplished teachers.**

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: The Eisenhower Professional Development Program: Federal Activities supports Objective 1.4 (A talented and dedicated teacher is in every classroom in America) and Objective 2.3 (Every eighth-grader masters challenging mathematics, including the foundations of algebra and geometry) by supporting grants to professional development demonstration projects and to the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. In addition, the program promotes access to high-quality math and science materials by supporting the Eisenhower National Clearinghouse.

Key Strategies

Development and Demonstration Projects:

- ❖ Develop priorities and monitor projects for alignment with the Department's Strategic Plan, with principles for high-quality professional development, and with high standards for content and student performance particularly in reading and mathematics.
- ❖ Identify effective approaches to cross-curricular instructional practices that emphasize the roles of reading and mathematics across the core academic subjects, and disseminate information on these approaches.
- ❖ Encourage funded projects to incorporate cross-curricular approaches emphasizing reading and mathematics in their professional development activities.

Eisenhower National Clearinghouse (ENC):

- ❖ Work with the Department s leadership teams, the National Science Foundation (NSF), other agencies, and the Eisenhower Regional Consortia to develop comprehensive strategies for improving the accessibility and quality of ENC products and for disseminating products to target audiences, tracking use of products, and obtaining customer feedback to ensure that the products are used effectively to improve mathematics and science education.

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards:

- ❖ Facilitate collaboration among grantees, state and local education agencies, institutions of higher education, professional organizations, and local partners to identify resources, coordinate services, collaborate, sustain efforts to improve professional development, and provide incentives and encourage teachers to apply for NBPTS certification.
- ❖ Work with the NBPTS to develop strategies to use NBPTS-certified teachers as resources for other Department programs and projects.

Fund for the Improvement of Education--$139,500,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: Contribute to achievement of the National Education Goals by supporting nationally significant and innovative projects for improving K-12 education.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: The Fund for the Improvement of Education supports all of the objectives under Goal 1 of the Strategic Plan by funding projects to help all students reach challenging academic standards and become prepared for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment.

Objective	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
1. Support the Department's strategic priorities in elementary and secondary education through nationally significant projects of high quality.	1.1 **Significant and supportive of strategic priorities.** 90% of the funded projects will support the Department's strategic priorities and receive at least an 80% rating for national significance.	*100% of new projects funded in FY 1998 supported the Department's strategic priorities. 83% of the projects peer reviewed were rated at least 80% for national significance. Average rating for national significance was 88%.*	1.1 Peer reviewer ratings, annual, 1998; review by Assistant Secretary's Office, annual, 1999.
	1.2 **High quality**. 90% of the funded projects will receive at least an 80% rating for quality of project design.	*66% of the new funded projects peer reviewed in FY 1998 were rated at least 80% for project design. The average rating for project design was 82%.*	1.2 Peer reviewer ratings, annual, 1998; review by Assistant Secretary's Office, annual, 1999.
	1.3 **Progress**. 90% of the projects funded annually will show evidence of progress on measures of their project-specific indicators.		1.3 Performance report review by Assistant Secretary's Office, annual, 1999.
2. Promote effective practices through timely and effective dissemination.	2.1 **Interim and Final Assessments**. At least 80% of funded projects will be assessed by peer reviewers as adding value to educational research or practice.		2.1 Peer reviewer ratings at midpoint or end of grant period, annual, 2000.
	2.2 **Dissemination**. The amount of information disseminated about lessons learned from interim and final assessments of projects will increase annually.		2.2 ED records of "hits" on relevant web sites and number of relevant print materials disseminated, annual, 2000.

Key Strategies

- Determine the extent to which applications support the strategic priorities as part of the review process, beginning in FY 1999.
- Closely monitor the formative evaluations of funded projects to improve the documentation of outcomes and impact, and assist the projects to use the data to improve practice
- Develop and implement a strategy for conducting interim and final peer review assessments of selected key projects.
- Develop a variety of products about lessons learned for key projects and disseminate that information nationally.

Javits Gifted And Talented Students Education--$6,500,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To improve the teaching and learning of gifted and talented students through research, demonstration projects, personnel training, and other activities of national significance.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: The Javits program supports research and evaluation that will improve the knowledge base on education reform (objective 4.3). The program has a special focus on special populations (objective 2.4) through its development of models for developing the talents of disadvantaged, LEP or disabled students.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
1. **Conduct research and evaluation on gifted and talented education that will improve the identification and teaching of gifted and talented students, and lead to a greater emphasis on high levels of performance for all students and total school improvement.**	1.1 **Utility.** More than 80% of recipients will report that the Center's research products and evaluation results contribute to their knowledge, skills, or professional work.	*The activities and accomplishments of the research sites indicate exemplary progress in carrying out the Center's mission, and the Center has had positive impacts on research and practice in gifted education at the local, state or regional, national, and international levels.*	1.1 Center External Evaluation Report, 1998; customer surveys, 1999.
2. **Develop models for developing the talents of students who are economically disadvantaged, have limited English proficiency or have disabilities.**	2.1 **Student identification.** All Javits-supported projects will increase the diversity of students identified as gifted and talented in their service region by at least 15% by the end of the project period.		2.1 Project reports, available1999; national evaluation, 1999.
3. **Demonstrate leadership in supporting and strengthening gifted and talented education and broadening its impact on total school improvement.**	3.1 **Utility.** A majority of recipients of Javits products and of participants in Javits-supported activities will report that these services improved their work in gifted and talented education.		3.1 National evaluation and customer surveys, 1999.

Key Strategies

- Work with national, state, and local associations and agencies through the National Research Center Advisory Council to develop a useful national R&D agenda for the Center, support dissemination of high-quality products from the Center, and establish competitive priorities for new grants that implement effective research-based practices that increase student diversity in gifted and talented education and improve the quality of programs.
- Provide on-line and print access to challenging teaching, content, and student performance standards and to exemplary materials in gifted and talented education.
- Conduct annual meetings of state directors of gifted and talented education, Javits grantees, and leaders in research and practice to address important issues in gifted and talented education, and facilitate networking among key practitioners through publications, mailings, joint conferences, and technical assistance.

Eisenhower Regional Mathematics and Science Education Consortia--$17,500,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To improve mathematics and science education through technical assistance and dissemination.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: The Eisenhower Mathematics and Science Education Consortia support objective 1.1 (states develop and implement challenging standards and assessments for all students in the core academic subjects), objective 1.4 (a talented and dedicated teacher is in every classroom in America), and Objective 2.3 (every 8th grader masters challenging mathematics, including the foundations of algebra and geometry) by providing standards-based professional development, technical assistance, and high-quality products in math and science.

Objective	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
Technical assistance			
1. **Provide high-quality technical assistance (planning assistance, training, facilitation of collaboration and networking, and other technical assistance).**	1.1 **Participants' practice.** At least 80% of the teachers, administrators, and providers of professional development who participate in the Consortia's continuing technical assistance will report improvement in their practice.	*As of 1996, 62% of participants said they had incorporated some new behavior into their jobs as a result of the Consortia-sponsored professional development. (National Evaluation, SRI, International & Policy Studies Associates, 1998.)*	1.1 Biennial customer survey; 1999; national evaluation; 2000.
	1.2 **Collaboration and networking.** At least 80 percent of members of Consortia teams and networks will report that value was added in one or more of the following ways: strengthening relationships; increasing service coordination; increasing access to resources; or leveraging resources.	*As of 1996, 67 % of members of Consortia teams/networks said membership had helped them obtain ideas and/or contacts that would strengthen their work. (National Evaluation, SRI International & Policy Studies Associates, 1998.)*	1.2 Biennial customer surveys, 1999; national evaluation, 2000.
Dissemination			
2. **Disseminate information about promising and exemplary practices in mathematics and science education.**	2.1 **Dissemination.** The number of Consortia contacts with customers by print and "hits" on electronic sites will increase by 10% annually.	*From October 1996 to September 1997, 306,557 contacts with customers were made by print and 1,354,167 "hits" on electronic sites were recorded. (Consortia reports, 1998.)*	2.1 Consortia reports, 1999.

Key Strategies

- Work with the Department's initiatives leadership teams and Executive Management Council, and with the National Science Foundation, to develop and implement integrated plans for work in mathematics and science education.
- Encourage the Consortia to consider the role of reading in mathematics and science education and to develop strategies for cross-curricular approaches that emphasize the roles of reading and mathematics in the academic preparation of all students.
- Work with the Consortia to develop effective strategies to reach targeted audiences and deliver high-quality services.
- Facilitate the collaboration of the Consortia and Eisenhower National Clearinghouse in the development of comprehensive strategies for disseminating products to target audiences, tracking use of products, and obtaining customer feedback.
- With the advice and guidance of their regional boards, the Consortia will set priorities for technical assistance activities in their regions and develop and implement strategic plans to identify key stakeholders and solicit their collaboration.

National Writing Project (NWP) --$10,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To improve the quality of student writing and learning, and the teaching of writing as a learning process in the nation's classrooms.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: The National Writing Project supports objective 1.1 (high standards and assessments) in its emphasis on helping students improve their writing and help them meet performance standards set by states. It also supports objective 1.2 (qualified teachers) by establishing teacher training programs to improve teachers' writing skills. It also supports objective 1.4 (family involvement) through its emphasis on linking NWP with the Family Involvement Partnership and the Read*Write*Now initiative.

Objective	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
1. **Support and promote the establishment of teacher training programs designed to improve the writing skills of students and teachers.**	1.1 **Teacher satisfaction**. At least 75% of NWP teacher participants will rate the programs as good or excellent.	*Using demand as indicator of satisfaction: 30,000 more participants in FY 98 than FY 97 (increase from 151,000 to 181,000).*	1.1 Evaluations from NWP teachers and the U.S. Department of Education monitoring team, annual, 1999.
	1.2 **Project site performance**. According to peer reviews, an increasing number of NWP sites will perform more effectively than in previous years and at least 75% of sites will meet NWP's standards for renewal.	*92% of sites renewed in FY 98.*	1.2 The NWP Site Survey prepared by Inverness Research Associates and national performance review, annual, 1999.
	1.3 **Improved student writing skills**. Students taught by NWP teachers will show improved student writing skills. NWP teachers will develop methods to assess student writing.		1.3 NWP Writing Assessment Report, 2000.

Key Strategies

- ❖ The U.S. Department of Education (ED) is to provide bridge services between the NWP and other student literacy programs, including Read*Write*Now, America Reads Challenge, and the Family Involvement Partnership. NWP has earmarked resources toward providing a coordinator to work with NWP sites and the other literacy programs. Several NWP sites have designed and conducted community events under the America Reads Challenge to promote reading and writing.
- ❖ NWP conducts annual peer review of each site and offers special services to sites, as needed, to ensure consistent high quality through ongoing review, evaluation, and technical assistance.
- ❖ ED to provide a link between NWP and ED customers interested in teaching methods of writing, through linking Web sites, developing a teacher discussion group on-line, and collaborating on a research and practice-based book for writing teachers.

Civic Education--$9,500,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: **To enhance the attainment of the third and sixth National Education Goals by educating students about the U.S. Constitution and the Bill of Rights.**

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: The "We the People" program for civic education supports objective 1.1 of the Strategic Plan. The program funds the Center for Civic Education to teach students about the history and principles of the Constitution of the United States and foster civic competence and responsibility.

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
1. **Provide high quality civic education curricula to elementary and secondary school students through the "We the People: The Citizen and the Constitution" program.**	1.1 **Student participation in the "We the People" program.** The number of adoptions of "We the People" curriculum will increase annually. 1.2 **Teacher institutes.** The number of teachers who attend the summer "We the People" professional development institutes will increase annually.		1.1 Annual grantee project report and annual grant application, 1999. 1.2 Annual grantee project report and annual grant application, 1999.
2. **Foster students' interest and ability to participate competently and responsibly in the democratic process.**	2.1 **Simulated congressional hearings**. At least 80% of sampled students in participating classes will have increased their knowledge of and support for democratic institutions and processes.		2.1 Annual random sample of participating classes, 1999.

Key Strategies

- ❖ Disseminate information about the "We the People" program through program coordinators and publications, in order to increase awareness of the value of civic education among educators.
- ❖ Support, with the Department of Justice, the development of curricular materials on the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.
- ❖ Participate in planning and administering the annual national hearings and student competition for "We the People" in Washington, D.C.
- ❖ Increase awareness of civic education through Department of Education public information vehicles.

International Education Program (Student Achievement Institute)--$7,000,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: To provide for an international education exchange program and the study of international programs and delivery systems.

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan:

Objectives	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
1. **Assist eligible countries to adapt and implement effective curricula and teacher training programs in civics and government education, and economic education developed in the U.S.**	1.1 **Curriculum and training programs.** An increasing number of educators from eligible countries will implement and improve curriculum and training programs in civics and government education as well as economic education 1.2 **Student knowledge and skills.** Participating students will demonstrate increased knowledge, skills, and traits of character in their understanding of civics, and democratic and economic principles	*In 1997-98 approximately 7,765 educators were involved in the implementation of curriculum and training programs in civic and economic education.*	1.1 Performance and evaluation report, annual, 1998. 1.2 Education Development Center evaluation of students, teachers, and scholars participating in economics program, 1999; Civics and government evaluation submitted by the Center for Civic education 1998.
2. **Create and implement educational programs for United States students which draw upon the experiences of emerging constitutional democracies.**	2.1 **Implementation of civic and economic education programs in the U.S.** An increasing number of students and teachers in the U.S. will participate in programs based on the experiences of emerging constitutional democracies.	*In 1997-98 approximately 117,336 students and 1700 teachers in the U.S. participated in civic and economic education programs*	2.1 Performance Report, annual, 1998.

Key Strategies

- ❖ Disseminate information about exemplary curricula and teacher training programs.
- ❖ Provide technical assistance to the grantees on curriculum frameworks.
- ❖ Conduct an annual site visit of selected programs in eligible countries to observe effects of programs.
- ❖ Encourage grantees to share lessons about the development and implementation of the educational programs.
- ❖ Monitor program by conducting site visits of selected programs.
- ❖ Encourage grantees to collaborate on project activities in common sites in eligible countries.

Civil Rights

Office for Civil Rights (OCR)–$73,262,000 (FY 2000)

Goal: **To ensure equal access to education for all students through the vigorous enforcement of civil rights.**

Relationship of Program to Strategic Plan: OCR is the principal office within ED that enforces federal civil rights laws. OCR also supports ED Strategic Plan Goals 1, 2, and 3 by ensuring equal access to education to enable all students to achieve high standards. By definition, "all students" in the ED Strategic Plan means students from all backgrounds regardless of race, national origin, color, disability, age, or gender.

Objective	Indicators	Performance Data	Source, Periodicity, Next Update
Impact on students			
1. To eliminate discriminatory educational practices within schools.	1.1 **Number of students affected.** The estimated number of students positively affected by OCR's work will increase. 1.3 **Increased compliance.** The number of recipients of federal funds (e.g., school districts, postsecondary institutions, state educational agencies) that change policies, procedures, or practices to comply with federal civil rights law will increase.	*During FY 1998, 1,378 recipients—consisting of approximately 1,013 school districts, 22 state education agencies with 2,936 school districts, 233 postsecondary institutions, and 2 state systems of higher education--changed policies, practices, and procedures to comply with federal civil rights law.*	1.1 Annual data from OCR Case Information System, 1999. 1.3 Annual data from OCR's Case Information System, 1999.
Empowerment of parents and students			
2. To teach parents and students how to resolve problems of securing equal access to high-quality education.	2.1 **Successful partnerships**. The number of partnerships with parents that lead to civil rights compliance will increase.	*OCR's Case Information System is being changed now to collect information. Initial baseline available March 1,1999, using FY 1999 data.*	2.1 Annual data from OCR Case Information System, 1999.
Efficient utilization of resources			
3. To obtain results by the efficient management of civil rights compliance activities.	3.1 **Resolution of complaints.** Eighty percent [80%] of the complaints are resolved within 180 days of receipt.	*Percentage of complaints resolved within 180 days of receipt:* *FY 1994 77 %* *FY 1997 80%* *FY 1998 81%*	3.1 Annual data from OCR Case Information System and analysis of complaint workload, 1999.

Key Strategies

- ❖ Implement a balanced enforcement program by initiating activities that target resources for maximum impact.
- ❖ Provide civil rights-related information, technical expertise, and assistance to a broad range of stakeholders engaged in collaborative efforts to ensure equal educational opportunity.
- ❖ Develop case resolution agreements that provide for the active participation of parents and students.
- ❖ Use performance measures, human resource development, and technology as a means to promote efficiency.

Numerical benchmarks and performance indicators provide one body of quantifiable information relevant to the assessment of OCR's work. There are many other facets to the evaluation of OCR's work that are not readily quantifiable, e.g., the professionalism and responsiveness of OCR staff.

Definitions:

High-quality education:	*Education that meets the standard established for all students by a state or school district, reflecting (1) high expectations for all students, (2) challenging curriculum and instruction, and (3) compliance with federal laws that are designed to ensure equal opportunity for all students.*
Positive Change:	*A recipient of federal funds changes policies, practices, and procedures to eliminate or prevent civil rights problems, and the "change" results in improved access for students.*

For additional copies of the Annual Plan, Volumes 1 or 2:

- Call 877-4ED-Pubs (877-433-7827)
- E-mail a request to: strategic_plan@ed.gov.
- Download an HTML or PDF file from the Department of Education's web site. The Annual Plan will be located under http://www.ed.gov/pubs/.
- For TTY/TDD call 877-576-7734.
- For a Braille or audio-tape version, call 202 260-9895.

For questions on this plan, call Geneise Cooke on 202 401-3132.